

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

JUN 16 1952

 PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

CONTENTS

PAGE

EIS, GERHARD.—Ein neues Fragment aus Heslers 'Apokalypse,'	381
ATKINS, STUART.—An "Ur-Urmeister"?	388
ZEYDEL, E. H.—Notes on Wolfram's 'Parzival,'	377
CAMPBELL, J. J.—The OE Bede: Book III, Chapters 16 to 20,	381
WRIGHT, NATHALIA.—'Messes from an Old Manse' and 'Moby-Dick': The Shock of Discovery,	387
EDEL, LEON.—'The Aspern Papers': Great-Aunt Wyckoff and Juliana Bordereau,	392
SHEPHERD, GEOFFREY.—The Sources of the OE 'Kentish Hymn,'	395
BREWER, D. S.—'Wanderer,' Lines 50-57,	398
DAVIES, R. T.—Chaucer's Madame Eglantine,	400
JONES, G. F.—Wittenwiler's "Liller,"	402
DUME, T. L.—Yeats' Golden Tree and Birds in the Byzantium Poema,	404
COTTEN, L. A.—Matthew Arnold's Pronunciation of the Name Isult,	407
TEDLOCK, E. W., JR.—A Forgotten War Poem by D. H. Lawrence,	410
DUBOIS, A. E.—Keeping Whitman's Tally,	414
HOLMAN, C. H.—The 'Hiawatha' Meter in 'The Yemassee,'	418
SUPER, R. H.—A Grain of Truth about Wordsworth and Browning, Landor and Swinburne,	419
GATES, W. B.—A Note on Cooper and Robinson Crusoe,	421
SNYDER, E. D.—Bowra on Poe: Corrections,	422
BURNAM, TOM.—Tennyson's 'Ringed Grooves' and Captain Ahab's Grooved Soul,	423
SHAW, E. P.—An Unpublished Letter of Moncrief concerning Diderot's "Père de famille,"	424
ARTINIAN, ARTINE.—Huymans to Mallarmé: An Unpublished Letter,	426

REVIEWS:—

IMBRIE BUFFUM, Agrippa d'Aubigné's <i>Les Tragiques</i> . A Study of the Baroque Style in Poetry. [H. A. Sauvercoin.]	427
HEINRICH SCHNEIDER, Lessing: Zwölf biographische Studien. [Heine Blum.]	429
RAINER MARIA RILKE, Letters to Berenice. [Norbert Pueret.]	431

BRIEF MENTION: WILLI FLEMMING (ed.), Andreas Gryphius, <i>Oedersee von Georgien</i> ,	432
---	-----

CORRESPONDENCE: The Death of William III: A Correction,	432
---	-----

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with Interruption from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER
KEMP MALONE
ARNO SCHIROKAUER

DON CAMERON ALLEN
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
EARL R. WASSERMAN

Advisory Editors

R. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, R. D. Havens, E. Malakis,
R. E. Roulston, I. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the Current annual volume is \$5.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$6.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: DNB., JEGP., MLN., MLR., MP., NED., PMLA., PQ., RE., SP., RES., TLS. Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

CHAPTERS on CHAUCER

by KEMP MALONE

HERE is the perfect book to accompany the study of Chaucer, written by a foremost scholar of mediaeval literature. After an introductory chapter which places Geoffrey Chaucer and the fourteenth century into the proper literary and historical setting, Dr. Malone focuses his attention on the poems themselves, ex-

ploring the poet's methods, analyzing his technique, interpreting his stories in the light of the period in which he lived. The greater part of this work is devoted to a study of *Troilus and Criseyde* and to *The Canterbury Tales*, although the shorter poems come in for their share of critical attention. \$3.50

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS BALTIMORE 18, MARYLAND

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1102
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXVII

JUNE, 1952

Number 6

EIN NEUES FRAGMENT AUS HESLERS APOKALYPSE

Unter einer Anzahl von Fragmenten, die mir im Sommer 1951 von der Württembergischen Landesbibliothek in Stuttgart mit der Bitte um Bestimmung des Inhalts zugesandt wurden, erwies sich ein Folioblatt als ein Bruchstück aus der *Apokalypse* des Deutschordensritters Heinrich von Hesler. Die Identifizierung gelang auf Grund von Stellen, die das bei Hesler häufige Klangspiel der einfachen Häufung (v. 4751 *Der elichen elicheit*, 4786 *unde duldige gedult*) und sein Lieblingswort *verharten* (4771, 4805) zeigen. Zu dem Blatt, das die Verse 4703-4864 (nach *Helms* Zählung) enthält, fand sich später noch ein aus derselben Handschrift stammender Streifen mit den Versen 11774-11785, 11810-11822, 11846-11858, 11882-11894.

Das Fragment stammt aus einer ansehnlichen Handschrift. Das vollständige Blatt ist 22 cm breit und 31, 2 cm hoch; der zweite Streifen ist genau so breit und 8, 2 cm hoch. In Einrichtung, Schrift und Sprache ähnelt es stark den bekannten Handschriften des Deutschen Ritterordens, doch gehört es offensichtlich zu keinem der bisher bekannt gewordenen Hesler-Fragmente. Der obere Rand ist 3, 3 cm, der untere 5, 8, der innere 1 cm und der äußere 6 cm breit. Die beiden Spalten beanspruchen zusammen 15 cm. Jede Spalte ist links durch zwei Linien begrenzt, zwischen denen die Anfangsbuchstaben der Verspaare stehen. Während die zweite Spalte durch eine lotrechte Linie begrenzt ist, fehlt hinter der ersten eine Begrenzungslinie, sodaß kein eigentlicher Selisraum vorhanden ist. Da aber der Text der linken Spalte nirgends bis nahe an die Anfangsbuchstaben der rechten Spalte heranreicht, sind die Kolumnen deutlich von einander geschieden. In der etwas jüngeren Königsberger Handschrift K^b, von der *Helms* Facsimile eine Probe

zeigt, ist der Selisraum durch eine weitere Linie festgelegt.—Auf jeder Spalte stehen 36 Verse. Die Zeilen sind vorliniert, wobei die oberste und die unterste Linie über den Schreibraum hinaus verlängert ist; dasselbe ist nach der sechsten und vor der siebtletzten Zeile der Fall.

Die Schrift ist eine gleichmäßige, sorgfältige Buchschrift, mit schwarzer Tinte geschrieben. Sie gehört in die erste Hälfte des 14. Jahrhunderts. Die *a* haben noch die für das 13. Jahrhundert kennzeichnende Form, *f* kommt auch am Silben- und Wortende vor, *s* und *z* werden geschieden, *r* ist in beiden Formen vertreten, das Wilhelm Meyersche Gesetz ist mehrfach zu beobachten. Über dem *i* steht fast regelmäßig ein dünner Strich. Es finden sich weder Interpunktionen noch irgendwelche Zeichen an den Vers- oder Reimpaarschlüssen. Jedes Verspaar fängt mit einer durch einen roten Punkt hervorgehobenen Majuskel an. Außerdem begegnen an den Absatzanfängen einfache, rot oder blau ausgeführte Initialen, die über zwei Zeilen reichen. Die Absätze stimmen mit den andern Handschriften der *Apokalypse* überein. Miniaturen sind nicht vorhanden, doch könnte die Handschrift nichtsdestoweniger illuminiert gewesen sein.

Das Blatt diente als Bucheinband. Es ist auf der Außenseite beschabt und auf der Innenseite voll gelbbraunen Leimspuren und Papierresten. An mehreren Stellen sind Löcher. Die Umriss des Buches, dem es als Ueberzug diente,¹ haben sich scharf eingepreßt. Der Rücken des Buches lag nicht in der Mitte des Blattes, sondern in der oberen Hälfte; deshalb sind nur die unteren Ecken abgeschrägt. Der obere Teil reichte nicht zum Ueberziehen des ganzen Buchdeckels aus, sodaß zu seiner Verlängerung der Streifen angestückt war. Von diesem haben sich an jener Stelle, wo er mit dem Hauptblatt zusammengeklebt war, Leimabdrücke erhalten, die aber bis auf den Versanfang *vñ iene* auch mit dem Spiegel nicht entziffert werden können.

Sprachlich zeigt das neue Bruchstück gegenüber der Danziger Handschrift wenig Unterschiede. Regelmäßig setzt der Schreiber *quit*, wo *D spricht* bietet (4798, 4800, 4808, 4814, 4823, 4830, 4840). Gegenüber *wen* wird *wente* bevorzugt (4720, 4756). Ein unverschobenes *t* begegnet in *twiges* 11854. Auffällig ist auch *troffen*

¹ Nach zwei jüngeren Einträgen auf den Rändern des Blattes handelte es sich um ein Zehentbuch.

und *cloffen* 4775/6 für *tropfen* und *clopfen*, *offer* 11822 und das Masculinum bei *paradis* 4779. *betruben* und *uben* D 4783/4 erscheinen mit *ô* : *betrouen* und *ouen*. Für D 4743/4 *almusin* : *vrusin* schreibt unser Fragment *almosin* : *urosin*; es ist kaum zu entscheiden, ob der Dichter *vrô* oder *vruo* gemeint hat. Zweifellos die richtige Lesart stellt *elichen* (in den anderen Hss. *erlichen*) *elicheit* 4751 dar und wohl auch *vol thuon* statt *wol tuen* 4757.

Der Abdruck erfolgt buchstabengetreu ohne Auflösung der Abkürzungen und ohne Normalisierung von *u* und *v*, *i* und *j*. Die beigefügten Verszahlen entsprechen der Ausgabe von *Helm*. Wo der Wortlaut gegenüber der Danziger Handschrift abweicht, wird deren Lesart in der Fußnote angeführt. Auch die von *Helm* verzeichneten Abweichungen der anderen Haupthandschriften werden notiert. Sie reichen allerdings nicht aus, um die Stellung des neuen Fragments im Handschriften-Stammbaum zu bestimmen. Ergänzte und nicht sicher lesbare Stellen werden kursiv gesetzt.

Blatt 1

(Sp. ra)	Wie sal iz nu komen vmme die die bewelen ire cleider hie
4705	Die cristenheit uorbosen ir toufe uorwarlosen Jr elicheit zu brechen waz sulwir zu den sprechen Sie sint ubele geborn
4710	ob sie gare sin uorlorn Nein sie truwen noch ene sin daz ist an uile luten schin Die uor vnmanigen iaren vil groze sundere waren
4715	Vñ starke sunde taten und aber wider traten Vñ buzten daz getane da <i>mite</i> sie gar ane Worden <i>al</i> ires meines
4720	wente <i>nie nicht</i> als vnreines Hir wart wil iz sich waschen mit lougenriber aschen Daz ist die ruwige bicht sin wandel newerde licht
4725	Ein wiz tuch uellet in daz hor vñ wirt uil wizzer dan <i>do uor</i>

- Der is hat mit wizzen uliz
also wirt der sundere wiz
Der sich hat beclutteret
- 4730 swen her wirt gelutteret
Vor unses herren vuzen
mit ruwen vā mit buzen
Oder in den hellewizzen
dar die thuuele selber wizzen
- 4735 Jn heizen vegevuren
mit manichualden schuren
Die sele dort also uaste
glicherwis als immetaste
- (Sp. rb) Daz golt unde silber notet
4740 daz man uf sporn da lotet
Die seligen uf der erden
die der note ledich werden
Mit gedulden mit almosin
und an iren gebete urosin
- 4745 Vn die mit suzen sinnen
got und irn nesten minnen
Vn mit anderen guten teten
daz sint die di sich da weten
Mit brutlicher wete
- 4750 daz dutet rechte stete
Der elichen elicheit
die tragen ir toufen cleit
Lutter und vnbewollen
und hant tugenden uollen
- 4755 Vnde sint uil selich geborn
wente sie sint uor gote irkorn
Ob sie uol thuon ir elicheit
mit ander ir guten arebeit
Jst aber daz wir uns handeln
- 4760 bosliche so sul wirz wandeln
Mit bitterem widerkoufe
so wir des uleisches toufe
Mit manslacht besmizen
uns elicheit zu slizen
- 4765 Mit roube mit lugene
mit ualsche mit trugene

4727 Der sin hat mit vitzzen *D*, witzzen *K*^b 4733 der hellewiezzen *D*
4734 Da die tuvel selber inne wiezzen *D*, Der sich die tuvel da vlizen *K*^b
(auf Rasur), *St* 4741 rote *Initiale* 4754 tugend envollen *M*, tugende
vollen *St*, tugenden vollen *DK*^b 4757 wol tuen *D*

- Mit uppichlicher hochuart
 getuon wider gotewart
 4770 Vñ den uzern menschen horwen
 uon dem wir binnen morwen
 So ne sulle wir nicht uorharten
 vñ suln zu den einwarten
 Vil ruwiges herzen loufen
 vnd den innern menschen toufen
 (Sp. vo) Mit ruwigen bicht troffen
 4776 die zu gotes gnaden cloffen
 Vñ den nie genade wart uorsaget
 swer mit den sine unde claget
 4780 Der hat gewis den paradys
 merket in der selbenwis
 Mugewir zwo marter doln
 ane vur und ane koln
 Daz wir den geist betrouen
 vñ ruwich iamer ouen
 4785 Vnd unse unde gote clagen
 unde duldige gedult tragen
 Vnd unser bosheit uns irschemen
 so uorbirt uns daz elle : : : en
 Die scheme martere : : : : :
 4790 *hir zu* bedarf man aller meist
 Des himelischen uolleistes
 desse martere des geistes
 Bat koninc daut geben im
 vñ sprach herre got uornim
 4795 Trubiz herze got mutet
 daz iz ruwen oberulutet
 Herre saltu nicht uorsman
 daz quit swen ich ruwen han
 Herre got entpfach mich
 4800 unde *quit* irbarme dich
 Mit ysope mich besprenge
 daz min herze ruwich brenge
 Daz iz uon trenen oberulieze
 daz iz den geist begieze
 4805 Die uorhartet was enbinnen

4767 oppischlicher *D*, uppiglicher *M*, uppiger *K^b St* 4768 Gote wart
D 4769 hulwen *DK*, horwen *K^b St* 4770 binnen uns besulwen *DK*,
 morwen *K St (M)* 4775 ruwiger *D* 4776 gnade *D* 4779 daz
 paradys *D* 4780 Merken *D*, Merket *K^b St* 4786 geduldige *D* 4788
 Daz wirbet uns der helle vemen *D* 4789 Die schemde martert den geist
D 4798 spricht swan ich ruwe *D* 4800 spricht *D* 4805 Der
 vorhartet *D*

- diner undes nesten minnen
 Vñ twach mich anderweide
 daz quit uorlich mich beide
 So du ruwich mich irureisches
 4810 lutterunge mines uleisches
 (Sp. vb) Von dem alden ubertrite
 da wir uorlorn worden mite
 Dar zu uon selbes mines meine
 daz quit got mache mir reine
 4815 Min uleisch mit rechter maze
 daz iz al vnzucht laze
 Dar zu twach mich an den sinnen
 mit dem wasche diner minnen
 Vñ mit warer ruwen unden
 4820 uon minen totlichen sunden
 Der ich mich dessen zwein bege
 so werde ich wizzer dan der sne
 Daz quit swen ich vul erde
 uon sunden reine werde
 4825 Daz min uleisch daz gar gebuzet
 des mich nu din zorn begruzet
 So werdich sunden luter
 als trut dir oder truter
 Als der nie sunden ulec gewan
 4830 ouch quit der selbe gute man
 Dauit an siner lere
 den argen vmme kere
 So ne werdet her nicht
 als her was ein arch wicht
 4835 Hir an gedenke cristenheit
 bewele nicht diner toufen cleit
 So ne darftu iz nicht waschen
 mit lougenriber aschen
 Vnd ist wiz an zu sene
 4840 daz quit sus dine trene
 Mit bitterlichen smerzen
 dines ruwigen herzen
 Ne darftu nuwet lazen
 wiltu dich sunden mazen
 4845 Vñ kus under dessen zwein
 der nim *antweder* ein

4806 und des *D* 4807 spricht: vorlich mir *D* 4814 spricht *D* 4819
 ruwe *D* 4823 spricht *D* 4826 Des nu din zorn mich begruzet *D* 4830
 spricht *D* 4833 So enwirt her me nicht *D* 4834 was e ein arger *D*
 4835 rote *Initiale* 4839 wiz durch *Ueberschreiben* aus wez gebessert
 4840 spricht *D* 4843 nicht lazen *D*

Blatt 2

- (Sp. ra) vñ iene die uon uns hinnen
 11775 Zu gots genaden sin gewarn
 daz die nicht diz gebot bewarn
 Sie ne biten sich got rechen
 die billicher solden sprechen
 Vater der irbarmicheit
- 11780 laz dich der uorlornen leit
 Durch dine gnaderbarmen
 vñ lose die uil armen
 Vnde uorgib en ir missetat
 wend an dir die gnadestat
- 11785 Wen du bist ales eine gut
 dan sien beten rechen ir blut

- (Sp. rb) vñ nicht waren unterschuzt
 11811 Weder arke noch alter
 vñ sie nichein gewalter
 Mitnicht a : : ictes zu schiet
 do wart haldene die diet
- 11815 Alter unde arken ober ein
 sus wart ein sache uon den zwein
 Vnd dutet der alden e
 die nicht lutterunge me
 Gerten uor ir obertrit
- 11820 wen des uleisches vmmesnit
 Vnd ir sunden leschen dachten
 mit dem offer daz sie brachten

- (Sp. va) und in hoffnungen haten
 Darke des gelobedes truch
 der bezeichnenunge genuch
 Vñ grozes heilichtumes uil
- 11850 daz ich san hir nennen wil
 Vor wiben vñ uor mann
 sie truch daz himel manne
 Daz got den urahelen gab
 sie truch arones twiges stab
- 11855 Der abe gesniten urucht gewan
 daz bezeichende got unde man:

11774 uns f. D 11775 gevarn D 11779 barmherzekeit D 11786 bist
 alleine gut D 11812 Noch si K^b St M, Noch sin D 11813 amettes
 D 11817 dutet daz volk der alden e D 11821 sunde D 11846
 hoffnungen D 11847 blaue Initiale 11853 Israhelen K^b, Irrahelen D

- Der heiligen heilicheit
in darken waren geleit
.
(Sp. vb) durch iz recht irslagen waren
Vn clageten ir arbeit
sprechende rich unse leit
11885 Diz was ein sunde getan
sulich widerwort sul wir han
Die seligen sint uornumftich
alles des got ist kumftich
Vn uolgen gar sins willen
11890 swar sien nicht mugen gestillen
Noch vnder uan mit suzer ule
da uordert sien daz her : rge : :
Merket tigere daz ich sage
zwischen dem iungesten tage
11892 vordern sie iz daz iz irge D 11893 blaue Initiale

GERHARD EIS

Freising

AN "UR-URMEISTER"?

The introduction and first part (pp. 5-113) of Hans M. Wolff's *Goethes Weg zur Humanität* (Bern, 1951)¹ concern themselves with the reconstruction of lost versions or discarded plans of three works by Goethe, viz. *Wilhelm Meisters theatralische Sendung*, *Torquato Tasso*, and *Egmont*. It is Wolff's assertion that "*Wilhelm Meister* und *Tasso* in erster Fassung schon in Frankfurt entstanden sind" and that some scenes of *Egmont* were composed at about the same time (i. e., before the end of 1773). Although these novel hypotheses are perhaps irrelevant to the theme of Goethe's moral evolution as treated in Wolff's book, which is a study of Goethe's development as a thinker rather than of his growth as a literary artist, the answer to the question of whether or not they are valid is of great importance to all students of eighteenth-century literature. For if Wolff is right in positing an "Ur-Urmeister" and an "Ur-Tasso" of 1773, and if he has correctly reconstructed these

¹ A discussion of the general thesis of this book will be found in my review, *MLN*, LXVII, 190 ff.

works, the prevailing picture of Goethe's development as a poet—and even the traditional evaluation of his stature as a novelist and as a dramatist—must undergo a radical change: whatever the merits of the *Theatralische Sendung*, they are surely diminished if it must be read as a careful reworking of a still earlier novel; the artistic powers of a writer whose *Tasso* took sixteen years and two revisions rather than eight years and one revision to compose would be considerably less impressive in the eyes of genetic-minded critics and biographers than they have been up to now. It therefore seems only fitting that Wolff's conclusions, the method by which he reaches them, and even the premises with which he begins, should here be submitted to critical scrutiny. To accept on insufficient grounds "eine Ansicht" which, as its proponent admits (p. 5), "nicht nur von der Auffassung der Mehrzahl der Forscher abweicht, sondern sogar mit Goethes eigenen Äußerungen, genauer mit seinem Schweigen in Widerspruch steht," would be to betray the first principles of philological and historical scholarship, and so I venture to examine in some detail Wolff's "Ur-Urmeister" hypothesis and, in so far as they throw light on the general validity of his methods, his *Tasso* and *Egmont* reconstructions.

All paragraphs but the first of Wolff's introduction are devoted to what he terms a "systematische Rechtfertigung" of the first part of his book, i. e., to an attempted demonstration of the unreliability of Goethe's own account in *Dichtung und Wahrheit* of the composition of his earlier works. Quoting words written to Reinhard in 1808,

Soviel habe ich überhaupt bey meinem Lebensgange bemerken können, daß das Publicum nicht immer weiß wie es mit den Gedichten, sehr selten aber, wie es mit dem Dichter dran ist. Ja ich läugne nicht, daß, weil ich dieses sehr früh gewahr wurde, es mir von jeher Spaß gemacht hat, Verstecken zu spielen,

Wolff concludes: "Goethe liebte es also, die Wahrheit zu verbergen und das Publikum irre zu führen, und daß *Dichtung und Wahrheit* von dieser allgemeinen Neigung keine Ausnahme bildet, läßt sich aus des Dichters eigenen Worten² erschließen" (p. 6). It is patently absurd to regard as taciturn on the subject of the composi-

² To Eckermann, March 30, 1831: "die erzählten einzelnen Fakta dienen bloß, um eine allgemeine Beobachtung, eine höhere Wahrheit zu bestätigen"—i. e., higher truth is confirmed by (*true*) facts.

tion of his works a writer whose utterances about them fill H. G. Gräff's nine volumes. Although T. Mann may have correctly asserted that "Die Neigung zur Geheimniskrämerei und zur vorsichtigen Verschwiegenheit über sein dichterisches Tun ist ein durchgehender Zug in Goethes menschlich-künstlerischem Charakter," it does not follow that Goethe's silences or misleading remarks about the reception of his works (their interpretation by a strange public) are incompatible with almost garrulous openness about the circumstances of their composition—let alone even with perfectly frank discussion of their content and significance in private discourse (Goethe-Schiller correspondence!). As for *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, that it is composed in accordance with a large design which must perforce preclude complete chronological accuracy has long been obvious; to claim that it represents deliberate misdirection on Goethe's part is, however, indefensible, and so Wolff's first premise (that apparent statements of fact in *Dichtung und Wahrheit* may be ignored at will because the autobiography's truth has "mit der historischen Wahrheit, die der moderne Forscher sucht, nichts zu tun"—p. 6) must be rejected as unproved.

The other important premise of Wolff's "systematische Rechtfertigung" is "daß in der Zeit von Ende 1771 (*Götz* 'ersonnen') bis Ende 1773 (*Götz* 'verbreitet') zahlreiche größere Werke entworfen und begonnen wurden," "daß sowohl dem *Wilhelm Meister* wie auch dem *Tasso* und dem *Egmont* Entwürfe aus der Wertherzeit zugrunde liegen und daß vermutlich selbst der *Iphigenie* ein Frankfurter Entwurf zu einer Orestie vorangegangen ist" (pp. 10-11). The factual evidence for this generalization about "zahlreiche größere Werke" is the quotation of the following statement from *Dichtung und Wahrheit*:

Jenes Schauspiel jedoch [*Götz*] beschäftigte bisher den Verfasser nicht allein, sondern, während es ersonnen, geschrieben, umgeschrieben, gedruckt und verbreitet wurde, bewegten sich noch viele andere Bilder und Vorschläge in seinem Geiste. Diejenigen, welche dramatisch zu behandeln waren, erhielten den Vorzug, am öftersten durchgedacht und der Vollendung angenähert zu werden . . .

Unfortunately, the conclusion of the second sentence quoted—it is suppressed by Wolff—actually controverts his argument, since in it Goethe goes on to explain that this was a time of "Übergang zu einer andern Darstellungsart" (*Selbstgespräch*, *Zwiegespräch*) hardly characteristic of the works specifically mentioned by Wolff.

And although Wolff boldly asserts that these lines from *Dichtung und Wahrheit* constitute "den einen Absatz, der auf Goethes Schaffen zwischen *Götz* und *Werther* Bezug nimmt," what we know—thanks, of course, in large part to *Dichtung und Wahrheit*—of Goethe's literary projects from the years in question is sufficient to explain the phrase "viele andere Bilder und Vorschläge" without the postulating of an "Ur-Urmeister," an "Ur-Tasso," an "Orestie" or even a 1773-*Egmont*. In its general form, then, Wolff's second premise must also be considered unproved.

Wolff's next premise, set forth at the beginning of his forty-nine pages on the hypothetical composition of *Wilhelm Meisters theatralische Sendung*, is aesthetico-psychological: a work of literature whose artistic intention is not continually transparent or completely unambiguous is most probably not an "Urfassung, sondern die Überarbeitung einer älteren Fassung" (p. 18). Obviously inapplicable to the work of such writers as Heine or Flaubert, this assumption, which is restated less explicitly in connection with Wolff's chapters on *Tasso* and *Egmont*, would have a certain force were it possible to demonstrate convincingly that in the case of Goethe's literary works *all* revisions were inferior in clarity of artistic intention to the versions which they were meant to supersede; since, however, this cannot be successfully demonstrated—the final version of "Es war ein König in Thule" is too generally acknowledged to be the best—Wolff's third premise must be discarded as worthless. Certainly it is not necessary to explain the technical maladroitness of *Wilhelm Meisters theatralische Sendung* in terms of interpolations made in the course of revision of an "Ur-Urmeister": the difficulty of mastering the complex structural form of the non-epistolary eighteenth-century novel, fundamentally incompatible with Goethe's method of executing his works at favorable moments—hence the "open" form of the *Wanderjahre* too—provides sufficient explanation, if it is also remembered that the work was slowly composed, of all its disturbing compositional features.

Although it may be unnecessary to posit an "Ur-Urmeister," there might nevertheless be evidence which pointed to the existence of such a work; if this evidence carried more weight than that confirming the traditional view of the composition of *Wilhelm Meister*, it would still be proper to accept Wolff's theory. We know that the earliest specific mention of the novel is the diary entry of

February 16, 1777 ("dictirt an W. Meister"), but we also have Köpke's account of an "älteste, später verworfene Bearbeitung" described to Tieck by Goethe's mother in 1806 ("hier sollte," writes Köpke, "die Heirath Wilhelms und Marianens den Abschluß machen"). Since the diary entry does not exclude the possibility of earlier work on the novel, Wolff finds Köpke's report—hearsay at fourth hand—plausible: the marriage of Wilhelm to a Mariane "unter dem Einfluß von Wilhelms Liebe geläutert" should not be frustrated simply by "einem Irrtum Wilhelms und einer Intrige Werners" (p. 19)—an argument attractive enough until it is remembered that the tragic separation of lovers (*Manon Lescaut*) is a standard plot ingredient in eighteenth-century novels with sentimental intrigue.

What is needed to make an "Ur-Urmeister" hypothesis plausible is first-hand evidence from 1773, and this Wolff claims to find both in Goethe's repeated ("wiederholt"—p. 20) mention in his letters of work on a novel in that year and in regularly discernible parallels between Goethe's novel and his life (letters, works) in 1772-73. There is but *one* mention of work on a novel in Goethe's letters of 1773 (*Der junge Goethe* III, 56), and *one* other reference to work on "Dramata, und Romanen und dergleichen" (III, 47). Although no less distinguished a scholar than Albert Leitzmann ("Studien zum Urmeister," *Goethe* x, 257-267; not cited by Wolff) has argued that the *Roman* of the letter of September 15 was the beginning of *Wilhelm Meisters theatralische Sendung* (passages usually misread as "Überarbeitung oder gar . . . Schöpfungen der achtziger Jahre"), there is at least one strong reason for not equating it with a *Wilhelm Meister*, and this is a fact adduced by Wolff in confirmation of his thesis that a large part of an "Ur-Urmeister" existed by November, 1773: in a letter to Goethe of the 6th Betty Jacobi acknowledges receipt of "Ihren mir zugeschickten Roman" in terms which imply reference, as Wolff rightly insists, to some "vollständiges oder nahezu vollständiges Werk." If the work were an "Ur-Urmeister," it is inexplicable that Betty Jacobi should refer to it cavalierly (a fact passed over in silence by Wolff and ignored by Leitzmann) as one which has "mich amüsiert, so wie Sie es haben wollten"³ and then write in more detail about the drama which

³ Cf. Morris' *Der junge Goethe*, vi, 274. (Wolff needlessly cites the isolated phrase "mir zugeschickten Roman" from "*Briefwechsel zwischen Goethe und F. H. Jacobi*, ed. Max Jacobi, S. 11" and fails to add "Leipzig, 1846.")

Goethe has also sent. It seems probable to me that, given the once current meaning "Erdichtetes" for *Roman*, the "mir zugeschickten Roman" in question is rather the "Mährgen" which Goethe could not send her in September (*D. j. G.* III, 53), and that the *Roman* whose copying by Seidel in November, 1775 (a fact interpreted by Wolff as implying the continued existence of the manuscript of a Frankfurt *Wilhelm Meister*), could be a similar short novellistic work.⁴

Admitting that the foregoing points represent only a "negative Beweisführung," Wolff finally marshals various parallel passages as "positive Zeugnisse" in support of his "Ur-Urmeister" hypothesis. Some of the parallels adduced are striking, others are far-fetched, but all are of questionable value for the simple reason that Wolff's fourth general premise—the acceptability of evidence afforded by parallel passages—is itself unsound. Such evidence has too often been interpreted with absurd results in the past (Düntzer's "identifications" of Storm-and-Stress passages in *Faust* immediately come to mind), and it is in any case obvious that ideas or motifs may be commonplaces or at least public property. If Goethe says more or less the same thing in something written in 1771 and in *Wilhelm Meisters theatralische Sendung*, simultaneity of composition is not proved: ideas which Goethe held before 1771 were still held by him when he composed some of the final passages of *Faust*, for even where there is much "Wechsel" there is also some "Dauer." It may well be that the action of the first book of the *Sendung* is, as Wolff suggests, better set in Wetzlar than in Frankfurt,⁵ but to assume that this—(or a "Wetzlar" "Motiv der Frau zwischen zwei Männern," surely one of the least localizable of motifs in literature) aids in dating an "Ur-Urmeister" is to disregard the obvious fact that poetry may be "emotion recollected in tranquility," is to fail to credit Goethe with possessing what even

⁴ Controverting the assumption of a *Wilhelm-Meister* manuscript already in existence before the "dictirt an Wilhelm Meister" entry is Goethe's letter to Merck of August 5, 1778, in which—a full year and a half later—he announces (unquestionably in reference to the *Sendung*) that "das erste Buch [ist] fertig."

⁵ B. Seuffert (*Goethes Theaterroman*, 1924) has more plausibly suggested that Goethe's "mittlere Reichstadt M."—cited by Wolff, p. 23, as "mittlere Reichstadt"—might be the Mühlhausen near Hochdorf and Hochstädt.

the poorest writer may possess: some powers of memory and perhaps some slight power of invention.

Perhaps the strongest argument against Wolff's "Ur-Urmeister" hypothesis is the disastrous result of his application of the same analytical methods to the two complete texts *Torquato Tasso* and *Iphigenie auf Tauris*: conclusions which have a certain plausibility when they are attached to the discussion of a literary project discarded as unsatisfactory by its author lose that plausibility when conclusions of the same type lead only to nonsense in connection with the interpretation of two self-contained works like *Tasso* and *Egmont*. Admitting that Goethe regarded *Tasso* as a "consequente Composition," Wolff nevertheless undertakes to demonstrate that it is "keinesfalls ein völlig einheitliches Werk"—and that it is therefore the product of an even longer period of gestation than usually believed. To assume that artistic unity is the automatic product of rapid literary composition (corollary of Wolff's third premise: revision leads to artistic disunity) is surely unwarranted; not only may it be doubted whether the *Geschichte Gottfriedens* is comparable in such unity to *Faust*, complex as is this product of almost a lifetime, but it may also be safely asserted that one reason for the ephemeral value of much hastily written "Trivaldichtung" is simply an author's failure to produce such unity by undertaking necessary revisions. Be this as it may, it seems to me that Wolff unjustifiably exaggerates the disunity to *Tasso* (not to dispute, for the moment, the assumption of disunity) when he declares:

Die Prinzessinhandlung bildet den Rahmen der Antoniohandlung, ohne jedoch selbst in die letztere einzugreifen; die *einzig* [italics mine] ersichtliche Verbindung besteht darin, daß der die Katastrophe bedingende Ausbruch von Tassos Leidenschaft zum Teil auf die Erregung zurückgeführt werden *kann* [italics mine], in die ihn die Vorfälle der Antoniohandlung versetzt haben (p. 66 f.).

For if *Tasso* is to show an artist incapable of distinguishing between the realm of subjective imagination and that of objective reality, it is surely proper that both realms should be represented *both* in the cast *and* in the action. Indeed, it is not what Wolff regards as a double action which has given rise to the critical platitude that *Tasso* is disunified, but rather the characterization of his antagonist Antonio: to this element may perhaps be attributed the impression

that Wolff's "Antoniohandlung" is somewhat untransparent—possibly no artistic defect in a drama of tragic schizophrenia—but obscurity is hardly to be explained away by assuming that

"hinter den Motiven, die Goethe bewußt in den Vordergrund schiebt, [sich] andere Motive verbergen oder zu verbergen scheinen, die von Wichtigkeit bleiben, obwohl sie der Dichter verleugnet oder versteckt" (p. 69).

Examining with laudable scrupulousness the inconsistencies of the character Tasso, Wolff concludes that they are inconsistencies of characterization revealing an earlier motivation of the action according to which, for instance,

"Antonio, der sich als Tassos Freund gebärdet, und Leonore, die Tasso zu sich nach Florenz zu ziehen vorgibt, in Wirklichkeit gemeinsame Sache gegen Tasso gemacht haben und beide daraufhin wirken, ihn aus Ferrara zu verdrängen" (p. 86).

On the basis of such "verdeckten Motive" postulated by himself and of the often remarked "Ähnlichkeit des *Tasso* mit dem *Werther*" (p. 90), Wolff concludes that an "Urfassung oder wenigstens ein erster Entwurf" of a Tasso drama dominated by the theme of court intrigue must, since the Weimar Goethe was a stranger to the "'poetischen Tyrannenhaß' der Frankfurter Periode" (p. 92), have taken shape by September, 1773. Although he considers his hypothesis proved by a few parallels between *Tasso* and certain of Goethe's writings from 1773, these parallels have neither more nor less value than those already adduced in connection with *Wilhelm Meisters theatralische Sendung*. That Tasso is not simply another Werther, but a "gesteigerter" one in a specifically Goethean sense, has in any case been made clear by E. M. Wilkinson in *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, XLIV, 305-28. One must certainly hesitate to trust a critic who can conclude that Act V, Scene 4 of *Tasso* represents a repudiation of platonic love by a Goethe who still subscribed to "ein mit dem Eintritt in Weimar überwundener Naturbegriff" (p. 101): it is surely a stylistic impossibility that Tasso's lines "Ich fühle mich im Innersten verändert, / Ich fühle mich von aller Not entladen. / Frei wie ein Gott, und alles dank ich dir!" (according to Wolff "waren diese Sprache und diese Vorstellungen dem Dichter der *Römischen Elegien* denkbar fremd geworden; dem Wertherdichter quollen sie aus dem Herzen; sicherlich dürfen wir sie ihm zuschreiben") or any

other part of this magnificent scene could have been written before Goethe had in his pre-Italian years achieved through the writing of *Iphigenie* full mastery of the language of classicized pathos.

A few specimens of Wolff's *Egmont* reconstruction will be sufficient to illustrate my final reason for declining to accept his "Ur-Urmeister" hypothesis. He identifies the drama mentioned in Goethe's letter to Johanna Falmer of October 18, 1773, as an *Egmont*. Persuaded that Goethe's political views in 1773 were those of Justus Möser, he finds it "sonderbar" that the Möserian Vansen should be characterized as "ein schlechter Kerl" (p. 105), and so is forced to conclude that he was Egmont's sympathetic secretary in the first draft. By similar reasoning he finds the political thought of the drama marked by "erhebliche Unklarheit" (p. 107), which leads him to surmise next that a play originally political has become one of "heroisches Vertrauen auf das Schicksal" (p. 109)—with unhappy results, since Egmont is politically frivolous despite his human attractiveness. (A drama is surely not to be read as a political tract, nor does a dramatic hero need to be a paragon of virtue; that *Egmont* can be interpreted very satisfactorily just as it is has also been nicely demonstrated by E. M. Wilkinson, "The Relation of Form and Meaning in Goethe's *Egmont*," *Publications of the English Goethe Society*, N. S. XVIII, 149-82.) And because he is convinced that the "Klärchenhandlung," alias "Brackenburgtragödie" and "Vorstudie zum *Werther*," could only have been conceived when Goethe was actively interested in Lotte (again "das Thema der Rivalität zweier Männer um eine Frau" [p. 111] adduced to date a work!), Wolff is forced to conclude that the revision of *Egmont* in Rome, by which Klärchen acquired Faustine-like traits (!), gave "den Anstoß zu den *Römischen Elegien*" (p. 112).

I believe that no student of Goethe who has any understanding whatever of the creative poetic process will be willing to accept as proved the hypotheses which Wolff so confidently offers. Even if his "positive Zeugnisse" were more positive, his piecemeal reading of *Tasso* and *Egmont* does violence to Goethe the poet.

STUART ATKINS

Harvard University

NOTES ON WOLFRAM'S *PARZIVAL*

In a recent article, "Auf den Spuren von Wolframs Kyot," published in *Neophilologus* xxxvi, January, 1952, pp. 21-32, I advanced the theory that Wolfram, who is very clear about his source in *Willehalm*, was impelled to invent the figure of Kyot as a mysterious source for much in his *Parzival*. The reason for this would be that he may have been indebted to authorities, some of whom were German or Austrian, and therefore of imperial allegiance, and some of French (Angevin) or English (Plantagenet) sympathies; that as a retainer of German princes he could, because of the bitter hostility existing between the two camps, ill afford to be more definite in stating his sources and in making *Parzival* half Angevin; and that his chief Anglo-French authority may have been Philip of Poitou, the *clericus* of King Richard the Lionheart. In the present notes I should like to dwell upon three further details which grow out of the same assumptions.

1. Wolfram mentions Kyot for the first time in Book VIII, where he is introduced in a passage dealing with a certain knight, Liddamus by name.¹ Various attempts, none generally accepted, have been made to explain the origin of this name. Ernst Martin rejects the connection with Solinus, who speaks of a Lygdamus (although he accepts this derivation with regard to another Liddamus whom Wolfram mentions in 770, 4).² Besides Solinus Paul Hagen mentions three other possible sources: 1. Propertius, who also mentions a Lygdamus, 2. another Roman elegiac poet by that name, and 3. a French novel.³ None of these suggestions seems convincing. As a rule Wolfram, whose names are usually quite arbitrarily chosen, does not derive them directly from Latin sources. Moreover, he tends to make derived names longer and more complicated, not simpler, as *é. g.* *Clârischanze* from *Clarissant*, *Lôgroys* from *Logres*, and *Gringuljete* from *Gringalet*.

¹ P 416, 17 ff.: *Dô disiu rede was getan,/ dô stuont dâ einer's küneges man,/ der was geheizen Liddamus./ Kiôt in selbe nennet sus./ Kiôt la schantiure hiez,/ den sîn kunst des niht erliez,/ er ensunge unde spræche sô/ des noch genuoge werdent frô.*

² *Wolframs von Eschenbach Parzival und Titurel* hg. u. erkl. 2. Teil. Halle 1903, 328.

³ *ZfdPh* 38 (1906), 16 f.

I would propose another derivation, which seems more attractive because it ties in Liddamus with the Eastern elements of the romance, and indeed at the very point where Kyot, the focus of these elements, is mentioned for the first time. My suggestion is that perhaps Liddamus is to be associated with the ancient town of Lydda in the Holy Land, as a Latinized personification. It is established that King Richard journeyed to Jerusalem by way of Lydda and Ramleh. Lydda was the seat of an old Christian community already mentioned in Acts. A chapel stood there over the tomb of St. George as early as the sixth century, and the Crusaders discovered a splendid tomb there. Late in the twelfth century they erected a new chapel near the old one, which had been destroyed several times. In 1191 Saladin razed this new chapel together with the village, but the ruins of it can be seen to this day.⁴ According to the armistice of September, 1192, between Richard and Saladin, Lydda and Ramleh were to be partitioned. Consequently Liddamus might be derived from Lydda, which Wolfram could have known from Philip, Hermann, Rupert of Durne, or some other authority whom he owed information about the Holy Land. But the most likely informant would have been someone in Richard's inner circle, like Philip.

2. My second conjecture concerns Duke Leopold of Austria, whose hostility to King Richard, discussed in detail in my *Neophilologus* article, is a matter of history. It is well established that many Germans, among them numerous members of the clergy, sympathized with the English king in his trouble with Emperor Henry VI and Duke Leopold.⁵ Now since Wolfram too seems to lean toward the Anglo-French side, at least in his emphasis on the Angevin background of Parzival as well as in other points, it would appear logical that he should also look unfavorably upon Leopold, who was the primary cause of Richard's imprisonment and shameful treatment, first in Austria and then in Germany. I believe that there may be a heavily veiled and uncomplimentary reminiscence referring to him in *Parzival*.

History reports that at Christmas, 1194, Leopold took part in a tournament in Graz which proved fatal to him. He fell from his

⁴ For the facts here given see Maude M. Holbach, *In the Footsteps of Richard Coeur de Lion*, Boston, 1912, 316.

⁵ Kate Norgate, *Richard the Lion Heart*, London, 1924, 272 f. and 285 f.

horse and broke one of his legs so badly that already on the following day gangrene set in and the leg had to be amputated. Since no surgeon was willing to perform this highly dangerous operation, Leopold summoned his chamberlain, himself set an axe to the crushed leg and commanded the chamberlain to drive the axe into the bone with a hammer. Three blows were necessary. The next morning the doctors announced to Leopold his impending death. On his deathbed Leopold repented his refusal to obey the Pope's behest to free the English hostages, renounce his claims against Richard, and return the sums he had already received. Only after agreeing to these terms was he promised reconciliation with the Church.⁶

What admirer of King Richard would not have been tempted to see in this mishap the avenging hand of fate? So perhaps Wolfram too. At any rate, he tells us how Keye, the grumpy steward of King Arthur, attacked the hero Parzival as he was in a dazed condition dreaming of his beloved wife Condwiramurs, and how Keye fell and broke his right arm and left leg in the assault: *P. 295, 23 ff. zwischen satelbogen und eime stein/Keyn zesewer arm undz winster bein/ zerbrach von disem gevelle:/ surzengel, satel, geschelle/ von dirre hurte gar zerbrast.* The passage becomes more significant perhaps when we consider that in Crestien, who relates a similar episode (v. 4313), Keus breaks only his right arm (*l'os del braz destre li brisa*). But it becomes even more significant when we compare the total situation as described by Wolfram with some details mentioned by Ansbert. In both cases the ground was rough (cf. *P. 282, 10*, and *295, 19*, with Ansbert as quoted in note 6 above). In both cases snow has fallen (*P. 281, 12*, and Ansbert). In both cases the fall may be interpreted as retribution for a wanton

⁶ An important primary source is the *Codex Strahoviensis. Enthält den Bericht des sog. Ansbert über den Kreuzzug Kaiser Friedrichs I.* . . . hg. v. Hippolyt Tauschinski u. Mathias Pangerl (*Fontes Rerum Austriacarum I. Abt. V. Band*), Wien 1863, 85, especially the passage: "Dum vero in nativitate domini [25. Dec.] in marchia adeptus noviter terre, in castro Graze, festum ageret et celebrem solempnitatem haberet, sequenti die solempnitatis [26. Dec.] equum durioris cervicis ascendens, obducta glatie parva nive circumductus, in quo sedebat cecidit, et licet in variis militie casibus miles exercitissimus fuerit, hic tamen infortunatum casum non evasis, quin crus per medium rumperetur, ita quod os et caro rumperetur." See also Friederich Wilken, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge nach morgenländischen Berichten*, 4. Teil, Leipzig 1826, 617.

attack, and in both cases the attacker breaks his leg badly. Does Wolfram combine what he found in Crestien with Leopold's experience? Such a technique was not unknown to him.

The fact that according to Wolfram Keye also possessed good qualities does not completely spoil the analogy—if it is one—when we remember that Wolfram may purposely be at pains to cover up his own tracks before the eyes of his imperial patrons, who sided with Leopold in his trouble with King Richard. But even if this is the case, Wolfram was certainly not trying to write a *roman à clef*. He is merely weaving significant contemporaneous happenings into a great work of art which did not originate in a vacuum, but rather during one of the most stirring epochs in the history of Europe.

3. In his paper "Gahmuret. Quellenstudien zu Wolframs Parzival," published in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Heidelberg Academy (*Phil.-Histor. Kl.* Nr. 1, Heidelberg 1940, 16 ff.), Friedrich Panzer finds a convincing source for the combat between Parzival and his half-brother Feirefiz (Book xv) in the *Ipomedon* of Hue de Rotelande, written between 1174 and 1191. But I would call attention also to a pertinent passage in the *Kreuzfahrt Ludwigs des Frommen*.⁷ It is lines 3464 ff., where a battle between a Saracen prince and Landgrave Ludwig is recounted. In the encounter the Saracen's lance is splintered. Ludwig slays his opponent (3502 f.): *mit valle suchter den grunen cle,/ daz sahen die heiden, ez tet in we*.⁸

The chief parallels between the *Ipomedon* and *Parzival* are: 1) Christian half-brothers, unknown to each other, meet at the seashore near a forest, 2) they engage in fierce combat, 3) each has an army close at hand, 4) there is a touching recognition scene. The chief differences are: 1) in *Parzival* the hero recognizes his half-brother (an infidel) by his dappled complexion after the latter has doffed his helmet, while in the *Ipomedon* a family ring is the means of recognition, 2) in *Parzival* the hero's sword is shattered, in *Ipomedon* his glove is torn off, exposing the ring.

⁷ I quote from Hans Naumann's edition in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Deutsche Chroniken* IV, 2, Berlin, 1923, which was not available when I wrote my *Neophilologus* article. Although this work, dating from the early fourteenth century, contains some inaccuracies, it is based upon personal reports of men who took part with Ludwig in the crusade. There is no evidence that it is in any way influenced by Wolfram's *Parzival*.

⁸ See also Carl Wesle in *PB-Beiträge* 72, 1, 2.

The *Ipomedon* was a new work when Wolfram set out to write his *Parzival*. The fact that its author came from the county of Herefordshire in southwestern England raises the question whether Wolfram might not have owed his familiarity with it to someone in the retinue of King Richard, perhaps to Philip of Poitou.

The chief parallels between the *Kreuzfahrt* and *Parzival* are: 1) the combat is between a prominent Christian knight and a noble infidel, 2) the latter is richly accoutered by his heathen ladylove (called his *amie* in the *Kreuzfahrt*, *Secundille* in *Parzival*), 3) the weapon of one of the fighters is shattered. The chief differences are: 1) in *Parzival* the sword of the Christian hero is shattered, in the *Kreuzfahrt* the lance of the Saracen, 2) in *Parzival* the infidel gallantly spares the Christian's life, while in the *Kreuzfahrt* the Christian slays the Saracen.

It is possible that at the court of Ludwig's brother Hermann, Wolfram heard of such an encounter on Ludwig's part and that he combined this with the episode in the *Ipomedon* to fashion the strikingly similar story of the combat of Parzival and Feirefiz. Certainly all the important elements of the two sources are clearly present in *Parzival*. If this is the case, we would have here another illustration of how eclectic Wolfram was in fusing those sources which go to make up the so-called Kyot element.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL

University of Cincinnati

THE OE BEDE: BOOK III, CHAPTERS 16 TO 20

In the third book of the Old English translation of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* there is a passage which stands apart from the rest of the work in that there are two separate and distinct renderings of the Latin. One version is contained in one group of MSS, the other in a second group, and this difference in treatment of this passage is the chief basis on which the stemma of MS relations has been set up. The passage is anomalous in that for the rest of the Bede translation the five extant MSS all stem from a single archetype. The MSS of course differ greatly among themselves in orthography and vocabulary, and none of them is a direct copy of the archetype, but it can be

demonstrated that for at least 97% of the work only one translation was ever made. For three and a half chapters of Book III, however, MS *T* and MS *B* contain a version of the text which differs so markedly from that of MSS *O*, *Ca* and *C*,¹ that it is impossible they could both have come from a single original.

The divergent versions begin in the middle of chapter 16 of the Latin text and extend through chapter 20, although neither the *TB* nor the *Oca* version translates all the Latin material of these chapters. The *TB* version leaves out part of chapter 17 and the *Oca* version omits all of chapters 19 and 20. Nowhere else in the text is there such disagreement among the MSS in the matter of material deleted.

Some discussion has been occasioned by this passage of two independent translations, but no very good explanation has been brought forward, and the relation of these two versions to the rest of the translation is still unclear. Thomas Miller, whose admirable research gave us the first good edition of the Bede and the first proof that the translation was the product of some unknown Mercian scholar rather than King Alfred, had a theory that the original translator left out these chapters altogether. They were then filled in, Miller argued, by two different editors at some stage in the later copying of the text.² This position was accepted, in the main, by the next editor of the Bede, Jacob Schipper,³ and it remained as the undisputed explanation of the passage until very recent times. Simeon Potter has now challenged this theory and suggested that somewhere on the *Oca* side of the stemma, a scribe was copying from a MS from which a few pages of the original translation had fallen out; this scribe secured a Latin text and translated the missing part anew.⁴ There are some difficulties with this explanation,

¹ I have used the abbreviated designations for the MSS throughout. Full descriptions can be found in either of the two good editions of the Bede: Thomas Miller (ed.), *The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History*, London, 1890, pp. xiii-xx; or Jacob Schipper (ed.), *König Alfreds Übersetzung von Bedas Kirchengeschichte*, Leipzig, 1899, pp. xii-xviii. For the line numbers used in this article to locate words and passages I have used Schipper's edition.

² Miller, *op. cit.*, p. xxiv.

³ Schipper, *op. cit.*, p. xxx.

⁴ Simeon Potter, "On the Relation of the Old English Bede to Werferth's Gregory and to Alfred's Translations," *Mémoires de la Société Royale des Sciences de Bohême*, 1930, p. 33.

in that it hardly seems that a scribe who was energetic and learned enough to start translating the missing section would leave off in the middle of his work and let the 19th and 20th chapters go untranslated. Whatever the case with the *OCa* version, however, I think Potter was essentially right in his contention that the *TB* version was part of the original translation. The evidence he presents for this assertion concerns the use of the dative absolute and the frequent occurrence of *in* rather than *on*, but it is too scanty and fragmentary to be entirely adequate. If we now apply our knowledge of the differences of vocabulary between the dialects of Old English we can see more clearly that the version contained in the MSS *T* and *B* was written in the Mercian dialect, like the rest of the text, and was in all probability part of the original archetypal translation.

In comparing the vocabulary of these two versions it is to be expected that there should be considerable divergence. They often use completely different constructions to render the Latin, and there is hardly a sentence without at least two or three variant words. Many of these variations are without significance—*timbran-ārēran*, line 1885; *oncnāwan-ongitan*, 1818; *wiðcweðan-wiðsacan*, 1992; etc.; these words are all Common Old English and either word in each pair might have been used by a translator from any part of the island. It would indeed be strange if two independent translations in Old English did not differ in vocabulary, so rich was the language in synonyms.

Some of the variations, however, are of some importance, for we find an impressive number of words in the *TB* version which could have been written only by a person whose native dialect was Mercian. These words, without exception, are missing from the *OCa* version. At line 1811, the *TB* version translates the Latin *statim* by *sōna instæpe* whereas the *OCa* version has merely *sōna*. *Instæpe* has long been recognized as a peculiarly Mercian word, completely foreign to the southern texts. Similarly, *fumus* at line 1803 is translated by the Anglian *rēc* in the *TB* version and by the COE *smic* in the *OCa* version. The Mercian word *sceððan* appears in the *TB* translation at line 1899 (also at 2183) to render *laedere* where the *OCa* version has *onhrinan*. The list of these Anglian words found in the *TB* version but not in the *OCa* version includes some of the best known and most reliable words which were confined to that dialect: *foregangan*, 2099; *gēna*, 2187, 2143 (at this point the West Saxon

scribe of the *B* MS, dissatisfied with this strange word, substituted the Saxon equivalent, *gýta*); *gewinn* in the meaning of *labor*, 2168; *lēoran*, 2197; *medmicel*, 2133, 2174; *sōpfæst* in the meaning of *just, right*, 2103; and *ymbsellan*, 2004 (the *OCa* version translates *vallare* by *yimbhringan* at this point).⁵

Besides these words whose restriction to the Anglian dialects has long been known, there are several other words in the *TB* version of this passage whose peculiarly Anglian character has not been noted before:

bebēodan, 1976. *OCa* reads *befāstan*, Latin *commendare*.

This word appears in the *Cura Pastoralis* and other WS texts in the meaning of *to command, order*, but in the meaning of *to commit, commend* (Miller translates this passage of the Bede by *to hand it over*), it occurs only in Anglian texts: Bd. iv 547; VPs, Spl. Ps. 30, 6; VPs, Par. Ps. 132, 4; Gen. A. 2859; Bl. Hm. 47, 19; 145, 31; etc.; *Læc*. 116, 8; and the dialectically uncertain Cleo. Gl.⁶

371, 29; 497, 2; St. Mary Homily,⁷ 448, 7. This word, like *winnan* and *sōpfæst*, seems to have been used in all dialects, but with a definite difference of meaning in Anglian. In the meaning we find here in the Bede it would not have been used in WS.

Compweorod, 1990. *OCa*. *fultum*, L. *miles*.

This compound appears in Rush. 2, Jn. 18, 12; Bl. Hm. 11, 24; Bd. II 340; III 2785 (*T* reads *biscopweorod*); and the uncertain Lorica Prayer published by Leonhardi, *Bib. Ags. Pr.* vi, 177, 8. The elements are COE, but this particular combination is not found in WS texts.

fromesta, 2000. *OCa*. *swā gōd*, L. *strenuissimus et eximius*.

from, *fram* as an adjective is a poetic word which occurs often in the

⁵ Of the words in the foregoing list, *rēc* and *sceððan* were identified as Anglian by Max Deutschbein, "Dialektisches in der Ags. Übersetzung von Bedas Kirchengeschichte," *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, XXVI, 169-244; *gēna*, *instæpe* and *lēoran* were discussed by Richard Jordan in *Eigentümlichkeiten des Englischen Wortschatzes* (*Angl. Forsch.*, xvii), Heidelberg, 1906; *gewinn* was identified as Anglian by Karl Wildhagen, *Der Psalter von Eadwine von Canterbury*, Halle, 1905; *sōpfæst* by Helen Bartlett, *The Metrical Division of the Paris Psalter*, Baltimore, 1896; *medmicel* by Günther Scherer, *Zur Geographie und Chronologie des angelsächsischen Wortschatzes*, Berlin, 1928; *foregangan* and *ymbsellan* by Hildegard Rauh, *Der Wortschatz der altenglischen Übersetzungen des Matthäus-Evangeliums*, Berlin, 1936.

⁶ The glossaries from the Cotton Cleopatra A III MS, published in the Wright-Wülker *Anglo-Saxon and Old English Vocabularies*, London, 1884.

⁷ A non-Ælfrician homily on St. Mary of Egypt included among Ælfric's *Lives of the Saints*. It is numbered 23b in Skeat's edition.

Psalters and the Anglian poetry. In the non-poetic texts it appears only in the Bd. and the glossaries: Cleo. Gl. 274, 33; 253, 19; 391, 32; Harley Gl. 232, 3. Its compounds *fromniss* and *fromscipe* also occur only in documents which originated in the Anglian territory.

oncerran, 1811. *OCa. onweorpan*, L. *mutare*.

This word is frequent in the poetry, and also appears in the glossaries, Bl. Hm., Martyrology, Boethius and the verse portion of the Paris Psalter. It does not appear at all in the late WS homilists and in Alfred it occurs only in one document, the Boethius, where it is written with an Anglian *e* rather than the usual EWS *ie*. This rarity in WS documents makes it seem that this compound of the COE *c(i)erran* was of Anglian formation.

spōna, 1907. *OCa. sprytla*, L. *astula*.

This word is also found in the Anglian Corpus Gl. 24, 24; Cleo. Gl. 411, 13; 347, 23; and the Bd. III 128. It is a relatively rare word, but it is recorded only in documents where Anglian influence is probable.

ðwitan, 1907. *OCa. ðceorfan*, L. *excidere*.

This is a rare Anglicism which occurs only in the poetry, the Bede and the *Læcebōc*, 292, 2.

wyrcniss, 2189. B. *weorc*, L. *operior*.^{*}

This word, formed in the Anglian fashion with the suffix added directly to the stem of the verb,^{*} is found outside the Bede only in the Psalters: VPs 106, 23 and Jun. Ps. 106, 23. It is of very frequent occurrence throughout the Bede text and was often deleted or changed by the WS scribes of the later manuscripts.

There is one word in this passage which seems to be a Saxonism. *Ymbhabban*, *to surround*, which occurs in both *T* and *B* at line 2003 is found elsewhere only in the Boethius, 53, 1; Orosius 24, 1, 3; Cleo. Gl. 367, 1; Liber Scintillarum 168, 18; Salisbury Aldhelm Glosses: Anglia XIII, 27, 5. It is entirely possible, however, that this word was not in the original translation at all, but is a Saxon substitution. Both the *T* and the *B* scribes did, on occasion, substitute Saxon words for the Anglian words they found in the original, and if a particularly rare Anglian word happened to appear at this spot, it would not be unnatural for them, each independent of the other, to put in a word more familiar to them. The only other occurrence of *ymbhabban* in the Bede is at line 293 in Book II, but there it is obviously *B*'s substitution for the rare *ymbhēpan*, which

^{*} The Latin ablative construction *Deo operante* is translated by the English *purh godcunde wyrcnesse*. Elsewhere in the Bede *wyrcniss* usually translates *operatio*.

^{*} See Jordan, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

appears in the other MSS. I suspect that the Anglian word, *ymbse-lan*, which appears here in the *B* MS in conjunction with *ymbhab-ban* (*B*'s exact reading is *ymbseald 7 ymbhæfd*) was the original word; *T* probably changed it to *ymbhæfd* outright, while *B* preserved it but added *ymbhæfd* to clarify the passage.

Even if this explanation seem too ingenious, the evidence of the other seventeen Anglian words is overwhelming. No one could have used so much Mercian vocabulary in the short space of three chapters and a half but a Mercian scholar. Moreover, the Anglian words used here are also extremely frequent throughout the rest of the Bede: all but two of them appear elsewhere in the text. *sceððan*, for instance, is always the word used to translated *laedere*, never *gederian*, the word seen in the *Oca* version. Similarly, *from*, *gēna*, *lēoran*, *medmicel* and *wyrcniss* are the usual words throughout the Bede translation to render their particular ideas. From the evidence of the vocabulary alone I think we can conclude that the *TB* version of this passage is Anglian and was part of the original, integral translation of the Bede.

Miller's objection to this position seems to be that the gap in the text (using the Latin text as the standard for the whole) was not completely filled by either the *TB* or the *Oca* version.¹⁰ If the *TB* version, however, were part of the original it would not be unusual to find that the translator left out lines 1918 to 1952. He did exactly the same sort of thing throughout the rest of the text, leaving out whole paragraphs or even whole chapters, sometimes in the most inexplicable fashion. The present deletion is more understandable than others, since the paragraph left out of the *TB* version expresses some reservations to the general praise of the missionary Aidan and adds Bede's criticism of that otherwise holy man's views on the Easter question. Following a favorite argument of Miller's, it would be easy to image a scribe or translator who particularly admired Aidan, and who would omit a section the ideas of which displeased him.

J. J. CAMPBELL

University of Illinois

¹⁰ He never explicitly states his grounds for believing that the *TB* version was not part of the total translation, but this argument appears on p. xxiv of his introduction in this connection and is the only objection he seems to make to that supposition.

MOSES FROM AN OLD MANSE AND MOBY-DICK:
THE SHOCK OF DISCOVERY

Moby-Dick presents the curious problem of an author's unquestionable masterpiece which, in terms of everything else he wrote, is an anomaly. In this novel Melville's unseen world is supernatural rather than metaphysical, revenge is a stronger motive than envy in demonic action, the blond image is superseded by the image of fire. Whence did these variations in pattern come? In part the answer seems to be: from Hawthorne's *Moses from an Old Manse*, which Melville read in the summer of 1850, when he was midway in the composition of his whaling romance. In his review of the volume for *The Literary World* he acknowledged "the shock of recognition"¹ he received upon encountering the proposition, fundamental to his own thought, that intellect and feeling are mutually dependent and should be so treated in fiction. But the shock of discovering that this proposition might be expressed in totally different terms remained to be recorded in the characterization and imagery of *Moby-Dick*.

When Melville wrote *Mardi*, his first consciously artistic creation, he projected a metaphysical and moral allegory whose main outlines are recognizable in everything he wrote thereafter. In the prevailing terms of this allegory, the ideal man combines a cool head and a warm heart, whereas the two principal imperfect character types, the intellectual and the sensualist, develop only one of these members. The chief characteristic of the head is envious aggression, a concept which links it with the demon principle, whereas the heart by its passivity is associated with the deity principle. Symbolic of these two principles is the dark-light antithesis which is Melville's most persistent image.

But Ahab is not only the intellectual in revolt, like Lucifer; he is, alone among Melville's characters, the intellectual as black magician, like Faust.² He is committed to Fedallah, who is called "the Devil" and "Beelzebub"; he dominates the crew by a

¹ Willard Thorp, ed., *Herman Melville. Representative Selections* (New York, American Book Co., c 1938), p. 339.

² In Goethe's poem, however, which may have been among the books by him which Melville read in 1849-51, the characterization lacks the overdeveloped head-underdeveloped heart pattern.

hypnotic gaze and breath; he performs a series of pseudo-scientific experiments which aim to circumvent nature; he is blasphemous; he evokes primarily the image of fire. He is also mutilated and vengeful.

The type is common in Hawthorne: the man of intellect endowed with scientific or artistic wizardry and, in the degree to which he is villainous, with a diabolical, hypnotic power, deformity, and vengeance. In the *Mosses*³ it appears in nearly a third of the selections. Two of them contain allusions to the Faust theme. Two others exhibit more detailed parallels with Ahab's story. The *Pequod's* blacksmith, Perth, resembles Aylmer's servant Aminidab in "The Birthmark": hairy and sooty from working at his forge, less sensitive than his master—whose sleep is disturbed by dreams,⁴ executing orders without understanding them, but unable to eradicate the scar which is a birthmark. The witches' communion and baptism in "Young Goodman Brown" have several points in common with Ahab's travesties of the same religious ceremonies and his fire worship. Brown arrives near midnight in the midst of a tempest at an altar-like rock, surrounded by four pines whose tops are flaming "like candles at an evening meeting," where new members are brought into "communion";⁵ the trees suddenly blaze higher as the Devil prepares to baptize the converts from a basin containing blood or another red liquid. Ahab uses the harpoon sockets as "chalices" in which to serve the grog "hot as Satan's hoof"; he baptizes his whale barbs in the blood of the harpooners, shouting "Ego non baptizo te in nomine patris, sed in nomine diaboli!"; in the chapter entitled "The Candles" he worships, in the midst of the midnight typhoon and in the guise of "Old Thunder," the corposants burning at the tops of the masts—"three

³ The last two characteristics of the type are not as clearly represented in this volume, however, as they are in the other books by Hawthorne which Melville read in 1850-51: *Twice Told Tales*, *The House of the Seven Gables*, and probably *The Scarlet Letter*.

⁴ Melville scored this episode in his copy of the *Mosses*, which is now in the Harvard College Library. Another earthy blacksmith in Hawthorne's volume is Robert Danforth in "The Artist of the Beautiful." The relationship of Prospero and Caliban was probably in the minds of both authors.

⁵ *Mosses from an Old Manse* (Boston, Houghton, c 1882), pp. 100, 97.

gigantic wax tapers before an altar," which at his invocation leap thrice their height.⁶

The fire imagery in *Moby-Dick* is more complex, however, than that which commonly accompanies the black magic theme. Here fire, which characteristically in Melville's head-heart configuration is a minor symbol of the human heart, attracts the head and functions equally with whiteness as the deity principle. But it has affinities with both the demonic and the divine; it is both mechanistic and creative. Ahab transforms his Anarcharsis Cloutz crew into a body "brave as fearless fire (and as mechanical)"; his inanimate leg is finished at the blacksmith's forge; gazing into the "artificial fire," in whose light the crew seem fiends, Ishmael almost capsize the *Pequod*. But the element sacred to the Persians and the Greeks is also here: the purpose of the try-works is to transmute the whale into oil, which purifies the ship and illumines the world; as a man-maker, Ahab, who calls himself a Greek god, is as Promethean as he considers Perth when he says, "I do deem it now a most meaning thing, that that old Greek, Prometheus, who made men, they say, should have been a blacksmith, and animated them with fire."⁷

Now a general fire imagery is diffused through all Hawthorne wrote, dominates half the selections in the *Mosses*, and twice embodies the author's theme and furnishes his title. "Fire Worship" alone contains most of the specific fire images which occur in *Moby-Dick*: the Promethean theft of the divine fire, volcanic eruptions, lightning, Zoroastrian fire worship,⁸ prairie fires, the forge's light, the burning pipe, the hearth, the infernal pit, the removal of one's shoes before treading supernaturally burning ground, fire as a mirror reflecting the thoughts of the fire-gazer.⁹

⁶ *Moby-Dick* (London, Constable, 1922), I, 207, 206; II, 261, 279. The letter in which Melville told Hawthorne the baptismal pronouncement was the secret motto of the book suggests that it was familiar to Hawthorne, for Melville broke off in an otherwise inexplicable manner, "*Ego non baptiso te in nomine—but make out the rest yourself.*" (Julian Hawthorne, *Nathaniel Hawthorne and his Wife*. Boston, Osgood, 1885, I, 400.)

⁷ *Moby-Dick*, II, 341 (see also 352), 181, 237.

⁸ In "Rappaccini's Daughter" Hawthorne describes this essay as "'Le Culte du Feu,' a folio volume of ponderous research into the religion and ritual of the old Persian Ghebers." (*Mosses from an Old Manse*, p. 108.)

⁹ This image recurs in "Sketches from Memory," wherein Hawthorne records that he so forgot himself looking at a phosphorescent decayed tree on the banks of the Erie Canal that he allowed the boat to depart without him.

This essay, moreover, is constructed by a technique more characteristic of Melville than of Hawthorne: the placing of a primary image or symbol at the center of a cluster of secondary images, as in the chapter on the whiteness of the whale.¹⁰

Furthermore, Hawthorne's fire imagery, which occurs most often in connection with his intellectual wizards, also possesses a double signification: it suggests a mechanistic principle in such pieces as "The Birthmark," "The Celestial Railroad," and "The Artist of the Beautiful," and a purifying, restorative principle in such as "Earth's Holocaust" (Melville referred to its "allegorical fire" in his review) and "A Virtuoso's Collection"—or, as they might be called, a false and a true creative principle. His allusions to the Promethean theme, too, allow for the same dualism: the true Prometheus is a giant capable of reaching heaven, recognized in "Earth's Holocaust" as being a rare achievement; yet the fire thus obtained may be abused, as it is when the Virtuoso introduces a salamander into it.¹¹

Yet in the very act of discovering Hawthorne's pattern of intellectual diabolism Melville altered it in significant details. Unlike Hawthorne, he distinguished between two kinds of magic: black and white, or as his annotations in his set of Shakespeare expressed it, "Not the (black art) Goetic but Theurgic magic—seeks converse with the Intelligence, Power, the Angel."¹² Hawthorne him-

¹⁰ The total structure of the *Mosses*, in fact, is comparable to *Moby-Dick*'s: the alternation between Hawthorne's tales and sketches, like that between Melville's narrative and expository chapters, is technically an alternation between scene and panorama. But Melville's peculiar dependence upon exposition, from *Typee* on, made some such development as this inevitable.

¹¹ Many parallels exist also in the general imagery of the two books: the faces of Robert Burns in "P.'s Correspondence" and of Elijah in *Moby-Dick* are furrowed like the bed of a torrent; the narrator of "Buds and Bird Voices" says men must ever be susceptible to spring (Melville quoted from the passage in his review), and wintry Ahab puts forth green sprouts a few days after the *Pequod* sets sail; had the New Adam read through the Harvard Library he would have staggered under the burden of mankind's accumulated knowledge, like Ahab, who feels on the day before the chase that he is Adam carrying the weight of the intervening centuries.

¹² Melville's Shakespeare is in the Harvard College Library. The two pages of annotations which consist largely of notes for a projected tale of a compact between the Devil and a human soul and contain a version of the "Ego non baptizo" line have been transcribed by Jay Leyda in his intro-

self seemed to him a practitioner of this art, a "wizard" with a "wild, witch-voice," whose "spell" had "witched" him in the *Mosses*, who was able, in praising *Moby-Dick*, to embrace "the ugly Socrates because you saw the flame in the mouth, and heard the rushing of the demon, the familiar,—and recognized the sound; for you have heard it in your own solitudes."¹³ In Melville's novels, however, the white or undiabolical approach to truth is not confined to the intellectual sphere, and is more often depicted in terms of the madness than of the "right reason" which composed, as his Shakespeare annotations said, "the extremes of one": the seizures of Babbalanja by his devil Azzageddi, the lunacy of Pip.

Unlike Hawthorne also, Melville persisted in regarding fire as primarily a symbol of the emotional and social rather than the intellectual life. In his review of the *Mosses* he quoted the two passages from "The Intelligence Office" and "A Select Party" which most nearly match Babbalanja's description of the ideal, warm-hearted, cool-headed man, and repeatedly hailed the author as a man of glowing heart. His comment on the character of Ethan Brand¹⁴ actually contradicts Hawthorne's imagistic meaning, for, posing that men of true intellect have hearts extending to their hams, it concluded, "And though you smoke them with the fire of tribulation, yet, like veritable hams, the head only gives the richer and the better flavor."¹⁵

With *Pierre* Melville returned to his own peculiar patterns of characterization and imagery in which to restate the problem, pre-occupying both him and Hawthorne, of the relationship between the head and the heart, the intellect and the feeling, the demonic

duction to *The Complete Stories of Herman Melville* (New York, Random House, c 1949), p. xi.

¹³ Thorp, *op. cit.*, pp. 330, 394, 328, 333, 394.

¹⁴ Brand's last words, "O Mother Earth . . . who art no more my Mother, and into whose bosom this frame shall never be resolved! . . . Come, deadly element of Fire,—henceforth my familiar friend! Embrace me, as I do thee!" are echoed in Ahab's invocation, "Oh! thou clear spirit of clear fire. . . . I will kneel and kiss thee. . . . But thou art but my fiery father; my sweet mother, I know not. . . . I leap with thee; I burn with thee; would fain be welded with thee. . . ." (*The House of the Seven Gables and The Snow-Image and Other Twice-Told Tales* (Boston, Houghton, c 1883), p. 496; *Moby-Dick*, II, 281-283). Melville read Hawthorne's story in *The Dollar Magazine* for May 1851.

¹⁵ Thorp, *op. cit.*, p. 392.

and the divine. Five years later the shock of discovering Hawthorne's patterns was still strong enough for Melville to make Bannadonna in "The Bell-Tower" a scientific artist, working with fire. But Bannadonna's complete materialism is more terrible than any pact with evil spirits. If for no other reason, Melville must ultimately have found the Faustian configuration inadequate because of his deepening perception of this great peril of the machine age.

NATHALIA WRIGHT

University of Tennessee

THE ASPERN PAPERS: GREAT-AUNT WYCKOFF AND
JULIANA BORDEREAU

The sources of *The Aspern Papers* have long been known. Henry James himself gave a reasonably full account in his preface of 1908 — his discovery that Jane Clairmont, half-sister of Mary Godwin Shelley and mother of Byron's Allegra, had lived to a ripe old age in Florence; the anecdote of the document-hunting American who became Jane Clairmont's lodger in the hope of prying from her some Shelley relics; the distant female relative of the old woman who lived with her and demanded marriage as the price for the documents. These "germs" by James's account, in the Italian setting, had sufficed to give him his tale. He wrote it swiftly in a few hours in Venice during the summer of 1887 and sent it off promptly to Thomas Bailey Aldrich for publication in the *Atlantic*, confident that he had written a little masterpiece.¹ Time has confirmed his judgment.

More details were divulged concerning the story's origins in Evan Charteris's *John Sargent* (New York 1927) where the document-hunting American was identified as Captain Silsbee, the Boston "Shelley-worshipper." Finally, publication of Henry James's notebooks in 1947 put us in possession of all the details and established that the Silsbee anecdote was told to James by the half-brother of Vernon Lee, Eugene Lee-Hamilton.

It has generally been assumed that Juliana Bordereau, the ancient mistress of Jeffrey Aspern and possessor of the Aspern papers, as

¹ It appeared in the March, April, May issues, 1888.

created by James, was modelled on Jane Clairmont. James, however, never saw Miss Clairmont, and in his preface amused himself with the thought that he *might* have looked her up had he known she had lived into his own time. What sufficed for him was the thought that he had "doubtless at several earlier seasons passed again and again, all unknowing, the door of her house, where she sat above, within call and in her habit as she lived. . . ." John Singer Sargent, who was born in Florence, remembered seeing her once when he was 13 and he may have described her to James. The novelist, however, needed no description to portray an aged woman—he had for years cultivated elderly females, Mme. Mohl in Paris, Mrs. Procter, Fanny Kemble. He considered them "windows on the past." But there is good reason for believing that if Juliana Bordereau was inspired by Jane Clairmont in the drama of the Shelley relics, someone else sat for the portrait.

Miss Bordereau is minutely described in *The Aspern Papers*, not at her first appearance but by stages. The Aspern enthusiast sees her as a "strange figure . . . too strange, literally resurgent." He cannot see her eyes; they are covered by a "horrible green shade." We get a glimpse of an old woman "very small and shrunken, bent forward with her hands in her lap. She was dressed in black and her head was wrapped in a piece of old black lace which showed no hair." We see her eyes only once, in the dramatic moment when the "publishing scoundrel" is caught red-handed seeking to rifle the desk. Juliana, white-haired and withered "had lifted the ever-lasting curtain that covered half her face, and for the first, the last, the only time, I beheld her extraordinary eyes. They glared at me; they were like a sudden drench, for a caught burglar, of a flood of gaslight; they made me horribly ashamed. I never shall forget her strange little bent white tottering figure, with its lifted head. . . ."

In *A Small Boy and Others* (New York 1913) Henry James sketches for us in two luminous pages the elder sister of his mother's grandmother as he remembered her in advanced age, from his boyhood years. The sketch is one of a series of brilliant family portraits to be found in the book, and totally neglected by criticism as source material for James's tales. Great-Aunt Wyckoff is remembered by Henry (he is writing at 70) as an "image of living antiquity . . . that I was never to see surpassed" which is what Juliana was—in fact she is humorously described in the tale at one

point as being 150. (Hollywood accepted the high figure with characteristic literalness, reduced it to a "plausible" 110 in its version of *The Aspern Papers*, screened as *The Lost Moment*.) James saw the Great-Aunt always enthroned, like Juliana, "hooded and draped and tucked in," giving brief orders like some divinity. Was she, the Small Boy wondered, really, as she seemed, so tremendously old? And the old man, writing this reminiscence, mused that "It was the Past that one touched in her, the American past of preponderant unutterable queerness. . . ." It is this remark which forges the main link between the hooded Great-Aunt Wyckoff and the green-shaded Juliana, for in creating the latter James explained in his preface "I delight in a palpable imaginable *visitable* past . . . the marks and signs of a world we may reach over to as by making a long arm we grasp an object at the other end of our own table." The *visitable* Past was "the poetry of the thing outlived and lost and gone."

Henry James, in his own life, had found the most vivid "*visitable* Past" in the New York of the 1850's between his sixth and twelfth years. We are not surprised therefore when we find him explaining, a few lines after his definition of the near-Past, that, in writing *The Aspern Papers*, "I thought New York . . . it was natural, it was fond and filial, to wonder if a few of the distilled drops mightn't be gathered from some vision of, say, 'old' New York . . . could a recognizable reflection of the Byronic age, in other words, be picked upon on the banks of the Hudson?"² He could find no Shelley and no Byron in early America, but he could validly predicate a romantic poet. It is this fact, this invoking of America while dreaming an old Venetian story, which adds a confirmatory touch to our speculation. That Great Aunt Wyckoff, an old lady, should resemble Juliana, an old lady, is understandable; that in dealing with old ladies Henry James should invoke the Past, with a capital "P," follows logically. But that he "thought New York" while projecting Jeffrey Aspern would mean that he would think of the one "image of living antiquity" that he was "never to see surpassed," and who might have been, in other circumstances, a Jane Clairmont or a Juliana. The Small Boy, in Manhattan of the mid-century, had reached over, making his little arm as long as possible and caught the old lady out of the

² Quotations are from Vol. XII of the New York Edition of Henry James's novels and tales, and the preface to that volume.

18th century with her "large face in which the odd blackness of eyebrow and of a couple of other touches suggested the conventional marks of a painted image . . . so rich and strange is the pleasure of finding the past—the Past above all—answered for to one's touch, this being our only way to be sure of it."

And the greater writer, at the height of his power, almost half a century later, by the same stroke recovered Jane Clairmont-Juliana Bordereau from the 18th century—postulating "a comparative American Byron" in Aspern to match "an American Miss Clairmont." In America, in James's experience, only Great-Aunt Wyckoff was "ancient" enough, and sufficiently out of a distant yet visitable past, to resemble Juliana.

LEON EDEL

New York University

THE SOURCES OF THE OE *KENTISH HYMN*

Philological attention has been paid to the so-called *Kentish Hymn* which together in MS Cotton Vespasian D. vi with the paraphrase of *Psalm 50* is of some importance in the history of the Kentish dialect of OE.¹ But the sources and theme of the *Hymn* have not been adequately noted.²

The *Hymn* is in fact a conflation and paraphrase of passages from the *Te Deum* and the *Gloria in excelsis*. The correspondences are set out below.

Hymn 1-6: cp. *Te Deum* ³

Te Deum laudamus; te Dominum confitemur.
Te æternum Patrem omnis terra veneratur.
Tibi omnes Angeli, tibi cæli et universæ
potestates . . . incessabili voce proclamant.

4-14: cp. *Gloria* ⁴

Gloria in excelsis Deo. Et in terra pax
hominibus bonæ voluntatis. Laudamus te,

¹ See E. van K. Dobbie, *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems, The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*, vol. VI, New York and London, 1942, *Introduction*, pp. lxxviii-lxxxiii, *Bibliography*, p. clxviii and for text of *Hymn*, pp. 87-8.

² Cp. *ibid.*, *Intro.*, p. lxxx.

³ Text from *Breviarium ad usum Sarum*, ed. F. Proctor and C. Wordsworth, vol. 2, Cambridge, 1879, col. 27: (pointing omitted).

⁴ Text from William Maskell, *The ancient Liturgy of the Church of England*, 3rd ed., Oxford, 1882, pp. 36 ff.

Benedicimus te. . . . Gratias agimus tibi propter
magnam gloriam tuam. Domine Deus, Rex cœlestis,
Deus Pater omnipotens.

and *Te Deum*

Pleni sunt cœli et terra majestatis gloriæ tuæ . . .
Te . . . laudat exercitus.
Te per orbem terrarum sancta confitetur Ecclesia,
Patrem immensæ majestatis.

15-21: cp. *Te Deum*

Venerandum tuum verum et unicum Filium . . .
Tu rex gloriæ Christe.
Tu Patris sempiternus es Filius . . .

22-24: cp. *Gloria*

Domine Deus, agnus Dei, Filius Patris.
Qui tollis peccata mundi . . .

25: cp. *Te Deum*

. . . quos pretioso sanguine redemisti . . .

29-35: cp. *Te Deum*

Tu ad dexteram Dei sedes in gloria Patris . . .
Æterna fac cum sanctis tuis in gloria numerari.
Salvum fac populum tuum Domine et benedic
hereditati tuæ.
Et rege eos: et extolle illos usque in æternum.

29-43: cp. *Gloria*

Qui sedes ad dexteram Patris, miserere nobis.
Quoniam tu solus sanctus, Tu solus Dominus,
Tu solus altissimus, Jesu Christe, Cum sancto
Spiritu, in gloria Dei Patris.

In view of the close correspondence of lines 7 ff. with the *Gloria* there is little significance in A. Brandl's comparison of these lines with the Song of the Three Children in *Daniel*, 362 ff. and *Azarias*, 73 ff.⁵ Some phrases in the *Hymn* appear to have been suggested or reinforced by reminiscence of the Nicene Creed: so, lines 12-4, 20-2, 29-31, 38-9. Lines 25-8 probably derive from association with liturgical material used in the devotion of the True Cross: cp. for example, O crux gloriosa, o crux adoranda, o lignum preciosum, et admirabile signum. Per quod et dyabolus est victus et mundus Christi sanguine redemptus.⁶

⁵ In H. Paul, *Grundriss der germanischen Philologie*, 2nd ed., vol. 2, pt. 1, p. 1049.

⁶ Respond in Third Nocturne in *exaltatione Sanctæ Crucis*, *Breviarium*

The composer of the *Hymn* has followed fairly closely the order and arrangement provided by the *Te Deum* and *Gloria*. But the conflation is less a prayer for intercession and less a confession of faith than either of the originals. It is rather an exposition on the single theme of the triune God in Majesty.

The tendency towards fusion of the *Te Deum* and *Gloria* has been remarked elsewhere in the texts of the early medieval Church. In the late 7th century *Antiphonary of Bangor* occurs a text of the *Gloria* with appended anthems drawn from the *Te Deum* and the *Psalms*.⁷ In the early Church the *Gloria* was used as a hymn of special thanksgiving and praise where later practice would have enjoined the *Te Deum*.⁸ But neither hymn appears to have been in common liturgical use before the 10th century. Apparently before about the year 1000 the clergy were permitted to sing the *Gloria* only upon Easter Day. Otherwise it was reserved for the episcopate.⁹ The use of the *Te Deum* at Rome was limited during the 9th century to the birthdays of the Popes, but by the middle of the 12th century it was in regular liturgical use there.¹⁰ Practice in England was most probably in advance of the notoriously conservative Roman use. On all grounds it seems most reasonable to consider the *Kentish Hymn* as a by-product of the liturgical expansion of reformed Benedictinism in England during the latter half of the 10th century.¹¹

GEOFFREY SHEPHERD

University of Birmingham

ad usum Sarum, vol. 3, 1886, col. 821; and cp. Anthem for Prime in *inventione Sanctae Crucis*, *ibid.*, col. 275.

⁷ F. E. Warren, *The Antiphonary of Bangor*, Pt. 2, *Henry Bradshaw Society's Publication*, x, pp. 76-9, prints in parallel six texts of these extended *Glorias*. Further on general relationship of *Gloria* and *Te Deum*, see Dom Paul Cagin, *L'euchologie latine*, Pt. 1, *Te Deum ou Illatio*, Appuldurcombe, 1906, pp. 117-37.

⁸ See F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, vol. 4, pt. 2, s. v. *Doxologie* II, col. 1532.

⁹ See Maskell, *op. cit.*, p. 35, note 30 and *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, *loc. cit.*, col. 1531.

¹⁰ See Paul Wagner, *Introduction to the Gregorian Melodies*, Pt. 1, trans. A. Orme and E. G. P. Wyatt, 2nd ed., *The Plainsong and Medieval Music Society*, p. 150.

¹¹ Cp. Dobbie, *loc. cit.*, p. lxxxiii.

WANDERER, LINES 50-57

Mr. W. J. B. Owen (*Modern Language Notes*, Vol. LXV, March 1950, pp. 161-5) has made an interesting survey of the possible meanings to be extracted from the *Wanderer*, lines 50-57, to which there seems little to be added from a lexicographical point of view. Commentators have found even the usually accepted meaning of the lines obscure; and Mr. Owen shows that the earliest recorded date of the proposed metaphorical meaning of *swimman* is 1553, and of *fleetan* is 1200. But it has always to be remembered that the O. E. lexicographical record is far from complete. Negative evidence in a case such as this is not conclusive. Perhaps largely because of this incompleteness most of the good O. E. poems we possess show words or meanings which appear to be unique in O. E. But even were our lexicographical knowledge of O. E. much greater, the poets seem to have written in so highly metaphorical a style that it is a fair guess that many meanings were coined for a particular poem and never or rarely used again. (The obvious example of a poet who makes his own words and meanings for a particular context, where they are poetically effective, is Shakespeare. Not all such successful creations were used by himself or anyone else again. But the same thing may be observed in the work of other poets.) In the light of these considerations, therefore, the lack of supporting evidence for a particular meaning arising at a certain date is an argument much less strong for the O. E. period than for (say) the eighteenth century.

The metaphorical meanings attributed to *swimman* and *fleetan* by the traditional kinds of interpretation, such as those of Wyatt, Miss Kershaw, and the other authorities Mr. Owen quotes, seem to be natural enough, indeed, and as poetry, hardly to require the sanction of a dictionary. But, of course, these meanings *are* on record, even if the only evidence (apart from that of the *Wanderer* itself), is a good deal later. Furthermore, the alternative meanings which have been suggested for the passage are hardly more satisfactory. Both Sedgefield's version and Mr. Owen's variant on it seem strained, and a further suggestion demands what Mr. Owen himself describes as a drastic emendation. However, if it can be shown that the poetic meaning normally given to the passage arises spontaneously in another poem written in English by a sailor, on

a similar subject, then we have some evidence that the meaning itself may be natural and unforced. This, combined with its undeniable poetic value, and the lack of positive evidence against it, gives us grounds to believe that it is, in fact, what the poet meant.

Herman Melville's *John Marr* is such another poem as the *Wanderer*. It is the nostalgic words of an old seaman, who is laid up on shore and speaking, in imagination, to and about the companions of the past, whom he will never see again.

I yearn as ye. But rafts that strain,
Parted, shall they lock again?
Twined we were, entwined, then riven,
Ever to new embracements driven,
Shifting gulf-weed of the main!
And how if one here shift no more,
Lodged by the flinging surge ashore?
Nor less, as now, in eve's decline,
Your shadowy fellowship is mine.
Ye float around me, form and feature:—
Tattooings, ear-rings, love-locks curled;
Barbarians of man's simpler nature,
Unworldly servers of the world.
Yea, present all, and dear to me,
Though shades, or scouring China's sea.¹

Naturally the two poems are not the same in their total effect. But there is a remarkably close similarity between them in their connection with the sea, their sense of loss, their bitter-sweet memory of past comradeship. (Melville, with his whaler's acquaintance with the oar, is a particularly happy example of one whose experience of the sea must have been very close to that of a sailor a thousand years earlier.) The meaning of the passage I have quoted is perfectly clear. Granted the essential similarity between the two poems, is it not reasonable to suppose that the two images they arouse (which *may* be similar), are so indeed? Once the general effect is decided, the questions of emendation and punctuation can be then seen to be minor problems.

D. S. BREWER

Birmingham, England

¹ *John Marr and other poems*, 1922. (Italics mine.)

CHAUCER'S MADAME EGLANTINE

To prove that "Eglentyne" is not a name with merely romantic associations and that it would be rash to infer from the Prioress' choice of it "the imperfectly submerged feminine characteristics of a fourteenth century religieuse," Mr. E. P. Kuhl¹ quotes a passage about the use of eglantine in the crowning of Christ from *Mandeville's Travels*. Three different plants with which He was successively crowned are there described, and the last of the three is *Eglentier*. Mr. Kuhl omits the next few lines, those in italics in the quotation below, and continues where it is said that "this" crown is extant, and that it ought to be worshipped since Christ wore it on the cross. But the lines Mr. Kuhl omits make his quotation quite misleading. "This" crown is not a crown of *Eglentier*.

And zee schulle undirstonde, that oure Lord Jesu, in that Nyghte that he was taken, he was y lad in to a Gardyn; and there he was first examyned righte scharply; and there the Jewes scorned him, and maden him a Crowne of the Braunches of Albespyne, that is White Thorn, that grew in that same Gardyn, and setten it on his Heved, so faste and so sore, that the Blood ran down be many places of his Visage, and of his Necke, and of his Schuldres. And therfore hathe White Thorn many Vertues: For he that berethe a Braunche on him thereoffe, no Thondre ne no maner of Tempest may dere him; ne in the Hows, that it is inne, may non evylle Gost entre ne come unto the place that it is inne. And in that same Gardyn, Seynt Petre denyed oure Lord thryes. Aftreward was oure Lord lad forthe before the Bisschoppes and the Maystres of the Lawe, in to another Gardyn of Anne; and there also he was examyned, repreved, and scorned, and crowned eft with a whyte Thorn, that Men clepethe Barbarynes, that grew in that Gardyn, and that hathe also manye Vertues. And aftreward he was lad in to a Gardyn of Cayphas, and there he was crowned with Eglentier.² And aftre he was lad in to the Chambre of Pylate, and there he was examynd and crowned. And the Jewes setten him in a Chayere and cladde him in a Mantelle; and there made thei the Crowne of Jonkes of the See; and there thei kneled to him, and skornede him, seyenge, "Ave, Rex Judeorum," that is to seye, "Heyl, Kyng of Jewes." And of this Crowne, half is at Parys, and the other half at Costantynoble. And this Crowne had Crist on his Heved, whan he was don upon the Cros; and therfore

¹ 'Chaucer's Madame Eglantine.' *MLN*, ix (1945). 325-6.

² There is no full critical text of *Mandeville's Travels*, but the edition of the Cotton MS. published in 1725 and reprinted in Halliwell's edition (v. n. 3) included a collation with seven MSS. and four old printed editions. One variant reading noted for "Eglentier" is *Eglentine*.

oughte Men to worschipe it and holde it more worthi than any of the othere.³

A little earlier in the same chapter there is a more explicit reference to the plant of which the extant crown was made.

And o partie of the Crowne of oure Lord, wherwith he was crowned, and on of the Nayles, and the Spere Heed, and many other Relikes ben in France, in the Kinges Chapelle. And the Crowne lythe in a Vesselle of Cristalle richely dyghte. For a Kyng of Fraunce boughte theise Relikes somtyme of the Jewes; to whom the Emperour had leyde hem to wedde, for a gret summe of Sylvre. And zif alle it be so, that Men seyn, that this Croune is of Thornes, zee schulle undirstonde, that it was of Jonkes of the See, that is to sey, Rushes of the See, that prykken als scharpely as Thornes. For I have seen and beholden many tymes that of Parys and that of Costanty-noble: For thei were bothe on, made of Russches of the See.⁴

It is this crown of *Russches of the See* and not the crown of *Eglentier* which is to be worshipped.

It may be thought that "Eglentyne" still seems a more pious name than was believed before Mr. Kuhl cited *Mandeville*, since *Eglentier* composed at least one of the crowns. But I know no other reference to its use, and strongly doubt Chaucer's acquaintance with any such legend. The note of Professor Hamelius on *jonkes of the see* in the *E.E.T.S.* edition is apposite.

As no source is given for the three kinds of thorn used in the Passion, we may suspect that the author of *Mandeville* invented them in imitation of the three or four kinds of wood in the Cross.⁵

Pleasant though it would be to think that in the name "Eglentyne" there are two layers of meaning, such as Mr. Kuhl maintains are found in the Rose as a medieval symbol, *Mandeville*, and *Mandeville* misused, can hardly be thought satisfactory proof of this.

What is more significant in connection with "Eglentyne" as the name for Chaucer's Prioress is the name "Idoine" for a nun to whom a bequest is made in the will of Elizabeth of Hainault.

³ *The Voiage and Travaile of Sir John Maundevile, Kt.* . Reprinted from the Edition of A. D. 1725. (Introduction, Additional Notes and Glossary by J. O. Halliwell) London, 1883. Pp. 13-14. I use this edition because Mr. Kuhl does.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 12-13.

⁵ *Mandeville's Travels*, ed. P. Hamelius. *E.E.T.S.*, O. S. 154 (1923). vol. II, p. 28.

Professor Manly translating the will⁶ points out that here is the name of an actual nun which is very "romantic." The twelfth century romance of *Amadas and Ydoine*, written in French though composed in England, is almost pure sentiment from beginning to end.

R. T. DAVIES

University of Liverpool,
England

WITTENWILER'S "LÜLLER"

The word *lüller* in Heinrich Wittenwiler's *Ring* has not yet been satisfactorily explained. During the peasant-tournament at Lappenhäusen, Wittenwiler states, "Den lüller hiess man trüllen auf."¹ Both Lexer and Grimm cite this verse and explain the word as the name of a dance,² although there is no reason for the villagers to call for a dance tune at this time. Edmund Wiessner, the foremost authority on the *Ring*, saw that this interpretation was false and suggested that the verse was a distortion of conventional phrases like "Pheiff auf, lieber spilman!" and "Den pheiffer hiess man schlahen auf" (*Ring*, 201, 5455). Thus he seemed to realize that the word "lüller" was an epithet of the minstrel; yet he was unable to discover its meaning.³ This failure was probably due to his erroneous belief that the Lappenhäusen minstrel played a cymbal.⁴ Three years ago I attempted to prove that the instrument in question was a bagpipe,⁵ but I was still unable to explain the word "lüller."

At last I have found a clue in a Middle Scots poem. In the Maitland version of "Christis Kirk on the Grene," which appears to be quite faulty, the minstrel is named "Thome lutar."⁶ This rendi-

¹ J. M. Manly. *Some new light on Chaucer*. (New York, 1926.) 207 f.

² Ed. E. Wiessner (Leipzig, 1931), v. 1149.

³ M. Lexer, *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1872), I, 1981. J. & W. Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1885), VI, 1288.

⁴ E. Wiessner, *Kommentar zu Heinrich Wittenwilers Ring* (Leipzig, 1935), note to v. 1149.

⁵ *Ibid.*, note to v. 182.

⁶ "Wittenwiler's Becki and the Medieval Bagpipe," *JEGP*, XLVIII (April, 1949), 209-28.

⁷ *The Maitland Folio Manuscript*, ed. W. Craigie (Edinburgh & London, 1919), I, 150, v. 51.

tion did not satisfy me, since fifteenth-century people considered the Apollinian lute as the polar opposite of the Dionysian bagpipe, which was the usual instrument at peasant dances.⁷ Therefore I compared the name "lutar" with the form given in the only other extant version of the poem and found that it appeared as "Thome lular."⁸ This form, which recalled the word in question, was finally clarified by Wright's dialect dictionary: "Lulls . . . Sc. . . Bagpipes . . . Cf. . . . Du. . . lulle-pijpe, a bagpipe."⁹ This suggests that the verse "Den lüller hiess man trüllen auf" should be interpreted as "They asked the bagpiper to play up." It is surprising that *DWb* failed to recognize the word "lüller," since it quotes another High German form of the word in the immediately preceding entry. This is a passage from Fischart's *Gargantua*, which says that people dance "nach den lustigen schalmeien, seifelen, pfeifenbeukelen, hend und maul, *lullenpfeifen*, schwegeln, maultrummen, schnurren, säutröglein, ruspfeifen, und anderm kunstreichen sackpfeifengeschlecht." The same volume lists another form of the word as: "Lollepfeife, f. tibia utricularis, lollepfeiff . . . niederl. lulpijpe, lullepijpe, ruyschpijpe" (*DWb*, VI, 1145). A Low German form of this word is recorded as "lol(1)ikenpipe" by Schiller-Lübben;¹⁰ but it does not seem to appear in any Alemanic dictionary, even though the basic verb does. However, negative information is never conclusive, and the absence of a word in a dialect dictionary does not prove its absence in the dialect. For example, the word *lullenpfeifen* does not appear in any Alsatian dictionaries;¹¹ yet, as we have seen, it appears in Fischart's *Gargantua*.

⁷ "Wittenwiler's *Becki* . . ." 215 ff. In "Peblis to the Play," which is similar to "Christis Kirk" in most respects, the minstrel plays a bagpipe (*Maitland Folio Manuscript*, I, 181, v. 194).

⁸ *The Bannatyne Manuscript*, ed. W. Ritchie (Edinburgh & London, 1928), II, 263, v. 37.

⁹ *English Dialect Dictionary*, ed. J. Wright (London, 1898 ff.), III, 689.

¹⁰ K. Schiller & A. Lübben, *Mittelniederdeutsches Wörterbuch* (Bremen, 1876), II, 718, 748.

¹¹ The verb *lullen* (suck, suckle, lull) appears in E. Martin & H. Lienhart, *Wörterbuch der elsässischen Mundarten* (Strassburg 1899), I, 584; Charles Schmidt, *Wörterbuch der Strassburger Mundart* (Strassburg, 1896), 70; H. Fischer, *Schwäbisches Wörterbuch* (Tübingen, 1914), IV, 1333; *Schweizerisches Idiotikon* (Frauenfeld 1895), III, 1261. However, no form of the word *lullenpfeife* appears in these works.

I would suggest that the word *lull* first became attached to the instrument in some Low German region and then remained with it during its travels; for there is no reason for a wandering minstrel to rename his instrument every time he crosses a linguistic frontier. After all, a *glockenspiel* remains a *glockenspiel*, even when played in an American orchestra. Perhaps "lüller" and "lular" were felt to be foreign words in both Switzerland and Scotland, a fact which would help explain why they were so seldom recorded. This would also explain why the scribe of the Maitland manuscript misunderstood the name "lular" and altered it to the more prevalent, but in this case meaningless, word, "lutar." In any case, it is probable that the audiences for which our two poems were originally written realized at once that the village minstrels of Lappenhäusen and Christ's Kirk were bagpipers.

GEORGE FENWICK JONES

Princeton University

YEATS' GOLDEN TREE AND BIRDS IN THE BYZANTIUM POEMS

In William Butler Yeats' Byzantium poems, the imagery of the golden tree and the golden birds is striking enough to warrant a further consideration of its genesis in the poet's mind. Although commentators have speculated on the possible sources of this imagery, no decision could be reached until the books Yeats read and the books Yeats did not read were known to us. Investigation of his reading now points to a specific volume which almost certainly provided him with the picture of the golden tree and the golden birds.

In "Sailing to Byzantium," written in 1926, we find the lines:

Once out of nature I shall never take
My bodily form from any natural thing,
But such a form as Grecian goldsmiths make
Of hammered gold and gold enamelling
To keep a drowsy Emperor awake;
Or set upon a golden bough to sing
To lords and ladies of Byzantium
Of what is past, or passing, or to come.¹

¹ *Collected Poems of W. B. Yeats* (New York, 1933), 224.

And in "Byzantium," written in 1930, we read:

Miracle, bird or golden handiwork,
More miracle than bird or handiwork,
Planted on the star-lit golden bough,
Or, by the moon embittered, scorn aloud
In glory of changeless metal
Common bird or petal
And all complexities of mire and blood.²

Yeats' note of explanation for these lines states: "I have read somewhere that in the Emperor's palace at Byzantium was a tree made of gold and silver, and artificial birds that sang."³

Three commentators have listed works in which Yeats might have found the golden tree and birds.⁴ But when we know Yeats' reading habits and reading abilities, it becomes clear that, for him, the possible sources are limited. His knowledge of Latin, Greek, and French was elementary. The pages, written in those languages, which he did struggle through were usually translated with the aid of other people, and there is no evidence that he, with or without assistance, found the Emperor's palace at Byzantium described in them. Nor is there evidence that Yeats read in English any of the volumes previously suggested as sources, except Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*.⁵

Yeats' knowledge of Byzantium was derived almost entirely from the books he read during the years he was writing the first version of *A Vision*, from 1917 to 1925. Before that time, all the history he knew "was what I remembered . . . from schooldays, or had

² *Ibid.*, 286.

³ *Ibid.*, 450.

⁴ Elder Olson suggests Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* and Finlay's *History of the Byzantine Empire*. See "'Sailing to Byzantium': Prolegomena to a Poetics of the Lyric," *University Review*, VIII (1942), 215. James A. Notopoulos favors Liudprand's *Antapodosis*, Diehl's *Manuel d'Art Byzantin*, and Metcalfe's translation of Paspates' *The Great Palace of Constantinople*. See "Sailing to Byzantium," *Classical Journal*, XLI (1945), 78-79. A. Norman Jeffares refers us to work by Georgius Syncellus, Psichari, Polites, Liudprand, Nashe, Clavijo, and Sir John Mandeville—and concludes that "it is not possible to decide upon the one version which was used by Yeats." See "Byzantine Poems of W. B. Yeats," *Review of English Studies*, XXII (1946), 48-49.

⁵ See my dissertation, *William Butler Yeats: A Survey of his Reading*, Temple University, 1950.

since learned from the plays of Shakespeare or the novels of Dumas." In 1919 he first turned to classical history in order to find material which would reënforce the cyclic theory he was developing. But he "could not so late in life . . . be a deep student. So there is little in what follows [in *A Vision*] but what comes from the most obvious authorities. Sometimes I did indeed stray from them, and sometimes the more vivid the fact the less do I remember my authority."⁶

He strayed from the "obvious authorities" when he read, in 1921, Mrs. Engenie Strong's *Apotheosis and After Life*⁷—"three lectures on certain phases of art and religion in the Roman Empire." He also read Franz Cumont's *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans*,⁸ Joseph Strzygowski's *Origin of Christian Church Art*,⁹ O. M. Dalton's *Byzantine Art and Archeology*, and W. G. Holmes' *The Age of Justinian and Theodora*.¹⁰ None of these volumes mentions the golden tree and the golden birds.

But in 1923, when Yeats was awarded the Nobel Prize, he used some of his money to buy books—including Gibbon's *Decline and Fall* and the Cambridge Ancient, Medieval, and Modern Histories—for his own library.¹¹ Browsing through these volumes, he would certainly have turned to the sections on Byzantium. Gibbon wrote of the Emperor Theophilus: "His fanciful magnificence employed the skill and patience of such artists as the times could afford; but the taste of Athens would have despised their frivolous and costly labors; a golden tree with its leaves and branches, which sheltered a multitude of birds warbling their artificial notes. . . ." ¹² *The Cambridge Medieval History* states: "Still further to emphasize the beauty of his palace, [Theophilus] adorned it with admirable specimens of the goldsmith's art. In the great hall of the Magnaura was a plane-tree made of gold, shading the imperial throne, on the branches of which golden birds were perched. . . . On audience-

⁶ W. B. Yeats, *Pages from a Diary Written in 1930* (Dublin, 1944), 3.

⁷ Letter to Mrs. Olivia Shakespear, in Richard Ellmann, *W. B. Yeats: The Man and the Masks* (New York, 1948), 243-244.

⁸ See *A Vision* (London, 1925), 150. Cf. Cumont (London, 1912), 5, 58.

⁹ See *Ibid.*, 174, 193. Cf. Strzygowski (London, 1923), 18 ff., 104 ff., 138 ff.

¹⁰ A. Norman Jeffares, "The Byzantine Poems of W. B. Yeats," 50.

¹¹ Jeffares, *W. B. Yeats: Man and Poet* (London, 1949), 236.

¹² (Everyman, 6 vols.), v, 458.

day, when foreign ministers entered the hall, the birds in the plane-tree fluttered and sang. . . ."¹² Of the two passages, the second is likely to have made the greater impression on Yeats' mind, and he made use of it in 1926 and 1930 when he wrote the Byzantium poems.

Since *The Cambridge Medieval History* contains a more than adequate suggestion for Yeats' imagery and note—the only thing lacking is the word "silver," which is an obvious sort of association—and since Yeats owned the volume in question, it is sensible to consider it as the source rather than to search for more unusual volumes which he almost certainly did not read.

THOMAS L. DUME

Detroit Institute of Technology

MATTHEW ARNOLD'S PRONUNCIATION OF THE NAME ISEULT

At no future time, if the continuity of civilization is preserved, will there be any doubt that T. S. Eliot pronounced *Eugenides* with a hard *g* and *Silvero* with the accent on the second syllable, for phonograph recordings have been made of Mr. Eliot's reading of *The Waste Land* and *Gerontion*; but controversy can continue indefinitely on how Shakespeare pronounced *Jaques* and whether the *ch* of *Petruchio* should be sounded as *ch*, *sh*, or *k*. If the song the sirens sang is not altogether beyond conjecture, the accentuation and pronunciation of proper names in plays and poems can occasionally be confidently determined. For example, though the name *Chillon* of Byron's *Prisoner of Chillon* is generally half-anglicized as *shi-lon'*, nothing could be plainer than that Byron accented the first syllable, not the second, as is demonstrated by the rhythm of the lines wherever the name occurs in the poem:

In Chillon's dungeons deep and old (l. 28)
Lake Leman lies by Chillon's walls (l. 107)
From Chillon's snow-white battlement (l. 111)¹

More interesting is the conjecture concerning Christopher Mar-

¹² (New York, 1927, 8 vols.), iv, 39.

¹ Line 9 of the *Sonnet on Chillon* can be read with the accent on either syllable of the name.

lowe's sounding of the name of his most famous character. Almost as confidently as in the case of the accenting of Byron's Chillon, we can say that Marlowe pronounced the first syllable of Faustus very much as the word *for* is pronounced. The evidence for this assertion is, I think, complete in two lines of the opening chorus of the play:

Only this, Gentles—we must now perform
The form of *Faustus'* fortunes, good or bad. (Pro., ll. 7-8)

The combination of alliteration and assonance may be excessive to our ears, but it strongly suggests the pronunciation *fô's'tus*.² Corroboration of this conjecture is given by Philip Henslowe, who in his papers mentions Marlowe's play more than twenty times, generally spelling the name "fostes," but also "fostus," "ffostes," "ffostose," "foster," and "fosstes"; never, however, "faustus."³

This way of determining how a name should be sounded by the rhythm of the poetic line and the assonance of the accented syllable with other syllables can be applied effectively to Matthew Arnold's *Iseult*.

When Arnold wrote *Tristram and Iseult* in the late 1840's he was, like most Englishmen of the day, only meagrely acquainted with the legend—knowledge of which he derived, it seems, from the *Revue de Paris* of 1841 and from John Colin Dunlop's *History of Fiction*.⁴ His unfamiliarity is indicated by his misaccentuation of the name Tyntagel. The text of 1852 (the first publication of *Tristram*) and the printings of 1853 and 1854 (with revisions) show that Arnold accented Tyntagel on the first and third syllables, as is illustrated by these two lines:

Keeps his court in Tyntagil (I, 134)
At Tyntagil, in King Marc's chapel old (III, 3) *

* Note also the following lines:

Go forward, *Faustus*, in that famous art (I, i, 75 and II, i, 15)

Learn thou of *Faustus* manly fortitude (I, iii, 87)

Quotations from *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*, ed. F. S. Boas (New York: Dial Press, 1932).

² *Henslowe's Diary*, ed. W. W. Greg (London: A. H. Bullen, 1904), cf. index, II, 384.

⁴ C. B. Tinker and H. F. Lowry, *The Poetry of Matthew Arnold: A Commentary* (Oxford University Press, 1940), pp. 106-10.

⁵ The name with this accentuation appears also in I, 60-61, 177; II, 115; III, 3. Quotations from Arnold's poem throughout this note are from the

Some one must have called Arnold's attention to this misaccentuation, for in later printings of the poem he revised each of the six lines in which the name occurs so that the accent should fall on the second syllable. The two lines quoted above were revised thus:

Dwells on loud Tyntagel's hill.
In King Marc's chapel, in Tyntagel old.

The name Iseult, referring both to the Irish princess and to the lady of the White Hands, appears thirty times in the three parts of the poem; and wherever the scansion of the line is unmistakable, the accent falls on the first syllable. For example, in the prevailing trochaic pentameter of Part II this accentuation of the name is the only satisfactory one:

Thou art paler—but thy sweet charm, Iseult (II, 25)
Go not far, O Iseult! from my grave (II, 92)
Iseult leaves thee, Tristram! never more (II, 100)

In the iambic pentameter of Part III the same accentuation is unmistakable: "Queen Iseult lay" (l. 2), "Then Iseult call'd" (l. 35), "From Iseult's lips" (l. 45), "Then Iseult took" (l. 61). Arnold did not revise any line to suggest the accenting of Iseult on the second syllable.

If, then, it is unmistakable that Arnold accented the first syllable of the name, what sound did he give it? To pronounce the vowel *i*, alone and accented, as *ē* or *ī* is somewhat awkward; the alternative is *ai* (as in *idol*, *icy*, *iron*, *Irish*, *ivy*), and this alternative seems to have been Arnold's choice. At this point I must appeal to the ear of the reader and ask if, in the following lines, *ai'soolt* is not more natural and harmonious than the alternatives *ē'soolt* and *ī'soolt*:

Ah! not the Iseult I desire (I, 8)
Iseult of Ireland (I, 82 and 114)
That first Iseult, princess bright (I, 126)
I forgive thee, Iseult! . . . (II, 28)
Close mine eyes, then seek the princess Iseult (II, 93)
The young surviving Iseult, one bright day (III, 5).

LYMAN A. COTTEN

University of North Carolina

edition of C. B. Tinker and H. F. Lowry, *The Poetical Works of Matthew Arnold* (Oxford University Press, 1950).

A FORGOTTEN WAR POEM BY D. H. LAWRENCE

In November, 1914, Lawrence received from America the War Number of *Poetry: A Magazine of Verse*. He disliked most of what he read. To Amy Lowell he wrote of her polyphonic prose "The Bombardment":

The war-atmosphere has blackened here—it is soaking in, and getting more like part of our daily life, and therefore much grimmer. So I was quite cross with you for writing about bohemian glass and stalks of flame, when the thing is so ugly and bitter to the soul.¹

He wrote to Harriet Monroe that he thought Richard Aldington's "War Yawp" "glib irreverence." He liked the idea and attitude of Louise Driscoll's "The Metal Checks," though her poetry was "pretty bad," and Karle Wilson Baker's "Unser Gott," though it was ugly. Maxwell Bodenheim's "The Camp Follower" he found to be "something for the nasty people of this world to batten on." In "a real fury" he had written his own war poem, "because it breaks my heart, this war." As for publication of the poem, he said to Miss Monroe:

. . . I don't particularly care if I don't hear of it any more. The war is dreadful. It is the business of the artist to follow it home to the heart of the individual fighters—not to talk in armies and nations and numbers. . . .²

This poem did not appear in *Poetry*, but it may well be the one Lawrence contributed to the May 1, 1915, "Special Imagist Number" of *The Egoist*, "Eloi, Eloi, Lama Sabachthani." Edited by Richard Aldington, the number had been calculated by Amy Lowell and Aldington to reach America immediately after the appearance of *Some Imagist Poets* and give the anthology needed advertising. Miss Lowell was infuriated by what she saw, and sent Aldington three reasons why she, Ferris Greenslet, and John Gould Fletcher objected to the issue. First, there was the presence on the front page of an article continued from the previous number, which hurt the effect as an Imagist number. Second, there was the hostility of Harold Monroe's criticism. Third, there was Lawrence's poem, which, she said,

¹ S. F. Damon, *Amy Lowell, A Chronicle*, Boston, 1935, p. 278.

² *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*, New York, 1936, p. 215.

for pure, farfetched indecency beats anything I have ever seen. Unfortunately these things are very quickly remarked over here. Two years ago "The International" had a cover which I considered perfectly harmless, but they were sued for sending indecent matter through the mails. Now I do not believe there will be prominence enough given to this poem of Lawrence's for us to be sued, although there might be: the Watch and Ward Society is very active; but it would do us immeasurable, incalculable harm to be associated with such an outpouring. . . . He loses his eye about things; sometimes I think his condition is almost pathological, and that he has a sort of erotic mania.*

Lawrence's poem does not appear in *Collected Poems*. Its exclusion need not have been a matter of choice, since by the time of collection, in 1928, it and its whereabouts might have been forgotten. It is worth reproduction now for several reasons. It adds to the Lawrence canon. It is a vivid example of how thoroughgoing was Lawrence's revulsion from the war and its challenge to his major theme thus far in his career. It forms a tiny but interesting chapter in the story of the Imagist movement. It reveals something of the opportunism and limitation of taste in Amy Lowell, though one must keep in mind that more than once she helped and defended Lawrence. The poem is well unified by its savage *image*, clearly produced in a moment of "real fury," of war as a perversion of sex. It is the *image*, not the terminology, that has power to shock. One may add, as a minor note, that the poem demonstrates the extremely free form Lawrence was adopting.

ELOI, ELOI, LAMA SABACHTHANI⁴

How I hate myself, this body which is me;
How it dogs me, what a galling shadow!
How I would like to cut off my hands,
And take out my intestines to torture them!

But I can't for it is written against me I must not,
I must preserve my life from hurt.

But then, that shadow's shadow of me,
The enemy!

God, how glad I am to hear the shells
Droning over, threatening me!
It is their threat, their loud, jeering threat,
Like screaming birds of Fate

*Damon, *op. cit.*, pp. 306-307.

⁴*The Egoist*, II (May 1, 1915), 75-76.

Wheeling to lacerate and rip up this my body,
It is the loud cries of these birds of pain
That gives me peace.

For I hate this body, which is so dear to me:
My legs, my breast, my belly:
My God, what agony they are to me;
For I dote on them with tenderness, and I hate them,
I hate them bitterly.

My God, that they should always be with me!
Nay, now at last thank God for the jeopardy,
For the shells, that the question is now no more before me.

I do not die, I am not even hurt,
But I kill my shadow's shadow of me!
And God is good, yes, God is very good!
I shot my man, I saw him crumble and hang
A moment as he fell—and grovel, and die.
And God is good, for I wanted him to die,
To twist, and grovel, and become a heap of dirt
In death. This death, his death, my death—
It is the same, this death.

So when I run at length thither across
To the trenches, I see again a face with blue eyes,
A blanched face, fixed and agonized,
Waiting. And I knew he wanted it.
Like a bridge he took my bayonet, wanting it,
Like a virgin the blade of my bayonet, wanting it,
And it sank to rest from me in him,
And I, the lover, am consummate,
And he is the bride, I have sown him with the seed
And planted and fertilized him.

But what are you, woman, peering through the rents
In the purple veil?

Would you peep in the empty house like a pilferer?
You are mistaken, the veil of flesh is rent
For the Lord to come forth at large, on the scent of blood,
Not for the thieves to enter, the pilferers.

Is there no reconciliation?
Is marriage only with death?
In death the consummation?
What I beget, must I beget of blood?
Are the guns and the steel the bridegroom,
Our flesh the bride?

I had dreamed of love, oh love, I had dreamed of love,
And the veil of the temple rent at the kiss on kiss,
And God revealed through the sweat and the heat of love,
And God abroad and alight on us everywhere,
Everywhere men and women alight with God,
My body glad as the bell of a flower
And hers a flowerbell swinging
In a breeze of knowledge.

Why should we hate, then, with this hate incarnate?
Why am I bridegroom of War, war's paramour?
What is the crime, that my seed is turned to blood,
My kiss to wounds?
Who is it will have it so, who did the crime?
And why do the women follow us satisfied,
Feed on our wounds like bread, receive our blood
Like glittering seed upon them for fulfilment?

Lord, what we have done we hereby expiate,
We expiate in our bodies' rents and rags
In our sheaf of self-gathered wounds: we go to meet
Our bride among the rustling chorus of shells,
Whose birds they are,
We give up, O Lord, our bodies to deadly hate,
We take the bride, O God, and our seed of life
Runs richly from us.
We expiate it thus, the unknowable crime,
We give hate her dues, O God, we yield her up
Our bodies to the expiation, Lord.

But shall I touch hands with death in killing that other,
The enemy, my brother?
Shall I offer to him my brotherly body to kill,
Be bridegroom or best man, as the case turns out?

The odds are even, and he will have it so.
It may be I shall give the bride
And the marriage shall be my brother's—it may be so—
I walk the earth intact hereafterwards;
The crime full-expiate, the Erinnyes sunk
Like blood in the earth again; we walk the earth
Unchallenged, intact, unabridged, henceforth a host
Cleansed and in concord from the bed of death.

ERNEST W. TEDLOCK, JR.

University of New Mexico

KEEPING WHITMAN'S TALLY

Probably every reader has noticed the recurrence in Whitman of the word "tally" and realized that the word is important. But reasons will be suggested for thinking that the experience behind the word has not always been understood and that therefore this experience should be called attention to, if only briefly. It is probable also that often Whitman may have described the experience of tallying without using the word.

The word itself is so common in Whitman, incidentally, that it seems to have been unconsciously "caught up" in the prose of Esther Shephard's *Walt Whitman's Pose*.

"Tally" is used significantly in "The Song of Myself" (Sect. 25),¹ "Song of the Open Road" (Sect. 6), "Song of the Answerer" (Sect. 2), "Song for Occupations" (Sect. 4), "To You" and "With Antecedents" (Sect. 2)² from "Birds of Passage," "Chanting the Square Deific" (Sect. 2), "Proud Music of the Storm" (Sect. 6), and "In Paths Untrodden" from "Calamus."³

The word and the experience are most dramatically naturalized in "When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloom'd." Here the tally is the act which makes possible a final scene for all the actors—the lilacs perennial, the thrush singing of death, the bright star falling to dark, death and the thought of death walking, and "I." And in this act, for me, the elegiac function of reconciliation with death is more formally accomplished than in any other elegy.

Any brief summary of all the tally-passages would, of course, be a simplification. The scope, temporal and spatial and "psychological," is considerable. The purpose or effect is unity between per-

¹ This passage illustrates Whitman's distrust of words, the like of which I know only in Sandburg who also did some tallying until he found, for example, "I gotta zoo in me."

² Cp. Vachel Lindsay's censer-beswung universe and Whitman's "The very sun swings itself and its system of planets around us, Its sun, and its again, all swing around us."

³ Probably the least fortunate tally-passage is in "Outlines for a Tomb." Here the millionaire is described as having "no heroism . . . nor war, nor glory." Nevertheless he becomes, like nature, a center from which labor radiates harmoniously, the security of "all the shows of laboring life . . .

Tallying the gifts of earth, large as the earth,
[His] name an earth, with mountains, fields and tides."

sons or things. The best tally-er is, of course, "I" or the poet,⁴ perhaps any poet. And the ultimate tally is with God until "I" and God become hardly distinguishable.

It is notable that almost invariably the tallying-experience comes unexpectedly. It is even more notable that it happens in solitude, "in paths untrodden," when loafing in the grass, when Whitman is with "Whoever you are" or some second self, "holding me now in hand," who is "That Shadow my Likeness." Probably most, if not all, of "Calamus" should be read with the possibility in mind that Whitman is not only the first, but also the second person.

And there is no doubt that the tallying is intended to be understood as a climax of an intuitive experience. There are many varieties of intuitive experience. But in all, certain stages or states can be predicted, (1) as of moil, with a sense of problem to be solved, (2) as of hunch or flash, an unexpected and hardly explicable solution, (3) as of being illuminated, having new knowledge not accountable to the operation of any known faculty, (4) as of whole(some)ness, inward joy, outward jubilation, as if one were standing tip-toe on a hill.

These states of the experience are often described by Whitman, sometimes even in sequence, and sometimes outside the passages in which the word "tally" occurs. That the experience has not always been understood seems to be proved by the incomplete re-printing of one of them, as well as by a general tendency for readers to sensationalize Whitman as somehow sexually unusual.

In Section 5 of the usual edition of "Song of Myself" are the following lines:

Loaf with me on the grass, loose the stop from your throat,
Not words, not music or rhyme I want, not custom or lecture,
not even the best,
Only the lull I like, the hum of your valved voice.

⁴ Under certain circumstances "I" contains the poet. The self can be split, as when in "When Lilacs . . ." "I" contemplates death, walking between death and the thought of death, while the poet-thrush sings life's outlet song of death. An analogous splitting of selves is in Poe's "Ulalume" where "I" and "Psyche, my soul" debate, and are reconciled only by the act of arrival at the tomb. Comparable self-dramatizations are in Amy Lowell, Gertrude Stein, Mary Austin, Conrad Aiken regarding himself in a mirror. The famous touch-passage, Sec. 28 of "Song of Myself," is probably a dramatized lyric. And these dualizations turn out to be important in Whitman.

I mind how we lay in June, such a transparent summer morning,
 You settled your head athwart my hips and gently turned over
 upon me,
 And parted the shirt from my bosom-bone, and plunged your
 tongue to my bare-striped heart,
 And reached till you felt my beard, and reached till you held
 my feet.

By themselves, as involving sexual imagery, these lines could be, and have been, sensationalized. They were in the original edition of *Leaves of Grass* (p. 15). And they were accordingly reprinted in Jay B. Hubbell's *American Life in Literature*, with succeeding lines that obviously describe an unexpected knowledge and exaltation such as would belong to states 2, 3, and 4 of an intuitive experience, lines beginning

Swiftly arose and spread around me the peace and joy and knowl-
 edge that pass all the art and argument of the earth;
 And I know that the hand of God is the elderhand of my own. . . .

But Mr. Hubbell left the entire passage open to misconception by omitting to reprint, even in the latest edition (1949), the preceding lines. These lines, given below, provide an antecedent for "you" and therefore for "we," desensationalizing the passage. They also complete the description of the experience by adding to it the moil (state 1).

Section 4 ends with a reference to days preceding Whitman's self-discovery, to days in contrast to the time of peace and purpose when he had found himself whole(some).

Backward I see in my own days where I sweated through fog with
 linguists and contenders,⁵
 I have [now] no mockings or arguments, I witness and wait.

The days of moil and debate being spent, not for these faints Whitman, or mourns or murmurs. For other joys, abundant recompense, follow. Section 5 opens with a suggestion of these—the lines have been in all editions. Says Whitman,

I believe in you my soul, the other I am must not abase itself
 to you,
 And you must not be abased to the other.

⁵ See note 1.

Obviously, the "other I am" is Body. And "you" being Soul, the loafing on the grass, the "we" lying one transparent morning—these were, not Whitman and somebody else, but Whitman's Body and Soul.⁶ In this intuitive experience, lyrical but dramatized, the Soul takes the measure or tally of the Body, head to foot, and finds it not wanting. So, there are illumination and exaltation, which Whitman immediately describes.

Here or elsewhere Whitman, for the need of his times, may have stressed the bodily more than the soulful. But Section 5 of "Song of Myself" is accurately descriptive of a tallying experience in which the word "tally" happens not to appear, and Whitman takes his place beside other accurate describers of intuitive experiences in poetry, such as Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley, Keats, Browning, and many moderns. Probably, too, in this common experience Whitman and transcendentalists discovered their affinities. The conditions necessary to produce such an experience are (1) that a sense of personal well-being or harmony makes one perceive other harmonies and gives one a sense of joy, or (2) that a perception of outer harmonies brings inner peace and a like sense of being whole and exalted.⁷ The effect is that the lucky person feels exactly opposite to the Hairy Ape—he utterly belongs within an accomplished unity.

The word "tally" seems excellent to describe the ultimate result of intuition for Whitman, and becomes a basic word in his poetry.

ARTHUR E. DUBOIS

Kent State University

⁶ See note 4. Note also "I too with my soul and body, We, a curious trio . . ." in "Pioneers, O Pioneers."

⁷ The first condition is instanced in Wordsworth's "Tintern Abbey"—at least, though nature plays a part in righting Wordsworth, he has to be right to perceive again "the nurse, the guide, the guardian of the heart." Similarly, inner joy was essential to Coleridge, and the "Ode to Dejection" followed the failure of this joy. The second condition is fulfilled in Shelley's "Hymn to Intellectual Beauty."

THE HIAWATHA METER IN THE YEMASSEE

In William Gilmore Simms' novel *The Yemassee* (1835) are a number of Indian chants and songs sufficiently similar in meter to Longfellow's *Song of Hiawatha* (1855) to be worthy of notice which they have not received.¹ Ceremonial songs and chants of the Yemassee Indians appear on pages 93-96, 167, 168, 169, 180, 185, 190, 191, 196-197, 198, and 250 of the novel.² They differ from the Indian poems preceding *Hiawatha* which Wilbur L. Schramm examined,³ in that Simms alone was attempting to represent directly the form that the Indians themselves used in speech and song; the others, including Longfellow, merely used this meter for narrative poems about Indians.

Simms brought to the writing of this novel a thorough knowledge of Indian history and lore and created for the book an "admirable background of tribal customs, chants and dances."⁴ Furthermore, he claimed that the book was true to the facts of the age and people it represented.⁵ We are, therefore, safe in assuming that as a poet and a conscious literary artist, Simms sought (and thought he had found) an appropriate English meter for his Indian chants and songs. The following section from one of the chants is typical of the meter he chose:

¹ Wilbur Lang Schramm, in "Hiawatha and Its Predecessors," *Philological Quarterly*, XI (Oct., 1932), 321-343, discusses many narrative poems on Indians but, quite naturally, does not mention Simms. Schramm's treatment of the *Hiawatha* meter is cursory (pp. 338-341). Waino Nyland, in "Kalevala as a Reputed Source of Longfellow's *Song of Hiawatha*," *American Literature*, XXII (Mar., 1950), 1-20, argues convincingly against the idea that Longfellow was indebted to the *Kalevala* but does not mention the songs in *The Yemassee* as earlier American poems employing the *Hiawatha* meter.

² Page references are to the American Fiction Series edition, edited by Alexander Cowie (New York, 1937).

³ Schramm, *op. cit.*

⁴ George Snell, *The Shapers of American Fiction 1798-1947* (New York, 1947), p. 29. See Albert Keiser, *The Indian in American Literature* (New York, 1933), pp. 154-174, where the thoroughness and accuracy of Simms' portraits of Indian life are praised.

⁵ See his dedicatory letter in *The Yemassee*.

"Says Opitchi-Manneyto,
Wherefore are my slaves so few—
Not for me the gallant chief,
Slaughtered by the Yemassee—
Blest, the slaughtered chief must go,
To the happy home that lies
In the bosom of the hills,
Where the game is never less,
Though the hunter always slays—
Where the plum-groves always bloom,
And the hunter never sleeps. . . ."

The most obvious similarity between these verses and *Hiawatha* is in the use of unrimed trochaic tetrameter. Similarly, the greatest difference is in Simms' use of catalexis, in contrast to Longfellow's use of the full eight-syllable line. Simms' lines, like Longfellow's, are usually, although not always, end-stopped, and they are bound together by parallelism of thought and initial reiteration of sound or syntax. The result is that the chants in *The Yemassee*, although inferior to *Hiawatha*, achieve roughly the same effects through the same devices. Thus it seems that a meter approximate to that of *Hiawatha* recommended itself to an American writer as suited for the accurate reproduction of Indian speech and song two decades before Longfellow wrote his Indian poem.

C. HUGH HOLMAN

University of North Carolina

A GRAIN OF TRUTH ABOUT WORDSWORTH AND BROWNING, LANDOR AND SWINBURNE

Sir Edmund Gosse's literary anecdotes are usually told with such finesse and sparkle that they make pleasant and memorable reading—unfortunately too memorable. For while no one is likely to take offence at Gosse's charming fictions about people he knew, it is quite another matter to see these repeated time and again by reputable scholars as if they were true. The discrediting of his account of the publication of the *Sonnets from the Portuguese* seems not to have been sufficient warning even to the Browning scholars;¹

¹ *The Yemassee*, p. 95.

² See John Carter and Graham Pollard, *An Enquiry into the Nature of*

and it is nearly impossible to find a recent book on Browning or on Swinburne which does not tell one of the following stories—yet both are false.

The first is that, at the supper at Talfourd's after the first performance of *Ion* on May 26, 1836, when Browning's health was proposed by the host, Wordsworth leaned across the table, and said, "with august affability, 'I am proud to drink your health, Mr. Browning!'"² The mantle was passing, it would seem, from the older to the younger generation. Unfortunately for the truth of a pleasant tale, Crabb Robinson's diary³ makes it very clear that Wordsworth, with no relish for late drinking, slipped away at the beginning of the evening's series of toasts, and long before Browning's name was proposed. Had Wordsworth actually been generous with praise at a time when Browning so desperately needed it, there would have been no "Lost Leader."

With respect to the second of Gosse's anecdotes, the evidence is not quite so instantly destructive, but we can say with certainty that the incident did not occur exactly as Gosse told it, and are probably right in supposing that it did not occur at all. The story is that toward the close of Swinburne's visit to Landor in Florence on March 4, 1864, Landor expressed the wish to present his guest with a masterpiece of (as Landor asserted) Correggio that was hanging on the wall. (The pedigree which Gosse makes Landor claim for the painting is simple burlesque of Landorian speech.) When Swinburne demurred at taking so valuable a gift, "Landor rose, and turning purple with anger, shouted, 'By God, sir, you shall!'" So Swinburne said no more, and the picture was sent to his hotel.⁴ There is abundant evidence, published and unpublished, that Landor by this time (he was in his ninetieth year) was so weak that he could hardly move from his chair without assistance, and that he was not only very deaf, but unable to speak above a whisper. No one who reads Swinburne's own account of the inter-

Certain Nineteenth Century Pamphlets (London, 1934), pp. 10-12 et passim; Fannie E. Ratchford, ed. *Letters of Thomas J. Wise to John Henry Wrenn* (New York, 1944), pp. 81-90.

² Edmund Gosse, *Robert Browning, Personalities* (London, 1890), p. 42.

³ *Henry Crabb Robinson on Books and Their Writers*, ed. Edith J. Morley (London, 1938), II, 494.

⁴ Edmund Gosse, *Life of Algernon Charles Swinburne* (London, 1917), p. 104.

view in the letter he wrote to Lord Houghton⁵ that evening, or who looks at the blotted and laboriously scrawled note which Landor addressed to "Swinburne Esq" after the visit,⁶ will suppose that Landor "rose, turned purple with anger, and shouted."

But the gift of the picture was probably never made. Except for this one anecdote, Gosse's account of the interview between Swinburne and Landor depends entirely on sources readily available in print. Swinburne described his meeting with Landor often enough to make his failure to mention the painting a rather significant one. Nor did anyone ever see the painting among Swinburne's possessions. As Gosse remarked, "What became of it seems to be unknown; Correggio or no Correggio, it would have an amusing association with two eminent and wilful persons." Perhaps that comment should have been warning enough to the gullible. Literary scholars owe a large debt to Sir Edmund Gosse, which they will not want to overlook; but they owe it also to their profession not to repeat any story of his that cannot be verified.

R. H. SUPER

The University of Michigan

A NOTE ON COOPER AND *ROBINSON CRUSOE*

Fenimore Cooper usually handled his source material effectively, but in *The Crater* the two incidents he lifted from *Robinson Crusoe* represent a somewhat amusing departure.

When Mark Woolston and Bob Betts are marooned on a Pacific island, Betts declares that they may have to "Robinson Crusoe it" there for the rest of their lives. Defoe's book was thus in Cooper's mind. He no doubt recalled the incident in which Crusoe meditates on his fate, lists the advantages and disadvantages of his situation, and takes comfort in the fact that his condition is no worse (*Robinson Crusoe*, Modern Library Edition, pp. 73-74). Mark Woolston, reminded of Crusoe's goats by their own "Kitty,"

⁵ Algernon Charles Swinburne, *Letters*, ed. Edmund Gosse and Thomas J. Wise (London, 1918), I, 19-22.

⁶ The original is in the Ashley Library, British Museum; for a facsimile, see Thomas J. Wise, *A Landor Library* (London, 1928), facing p. 74.

also falls into a meditation on his fate. In treating this situation, Cooper employs the singular number, as though Mark were alone on the island. Like Robinson Crusoe, Woolston sums up the advantages and disadvantages, resolves not to repine, and continues his walk "in a more calm and resigned mood" (*The Crater*, Townsend Edition, pp. 96-98).

During a desperate illness, Robinson Crusoe soaks tobacco in rum and drinks off a stiff draught. He at once falls into a deep sleep. When he wakes, he is much improved, and he determines thereafter to think more deeply on religion than ever before (*R. C.*, pp. 96-108). In practically identical circumstances (Betts having been swept out to sea), Mark Woolston is taken ill. He too tosses off a huge drink and soon falls into a deep and prolonged sleep. He wakes much improved and also determines to give more thought to religion in the future (*Crater*, pp. 141-144).

In handling the first of these incidents, Cooper apparently forgot the presence of Bob Betts on the island. In the second, he evidently overlooked the fact that throughout the story he had been portraying Woolston as a deeply religious man. The religious conversion appropriate for the ungodly Robinson Crusoe was not appropriate for Mark Woolston. Thus, in these incidents, Cooper was following his source so closely that he lost sight of his own previously established situation and character.

W. B. GATES

Texas Technological College

BOWRA ON POE: CORRECTIONS

In his recent volume *The Romantic Imagination* Professor C. M. Bowra has achieved a new record for biographical inaccuracy about Poe, making at least three demonstrable errors of fact in as many sentences:

. . . Poe wrote no love-poetry in the ordinary sense of the word, that is, poetry addressed to a living person as a living person. His nearest approach to it is the famous poem "To Helen," which he wrote when he was still a boy, and even this speaks to an ideal rather than a real woman, to a goddess from another world who impresses him with her holiness:

Lo! in you brilliant window-niche
How statue-like I see thee stand!
The agate lamp within thy hand,

Ah! Psyche, from the regions which
Are holy land!

In later years Poe said this was addressed to his "first purely ideal love," Helen Scullard. . . .¹

The facts are as follows:

(1) Poe did write a love-poem in the ordinary sense of the word, "addressed to a living person as a living person."

(2) It is not the poem quoted by Professor Bowra but the less famous "To Helen," beginning

I saw thee once—once only—years ago.

It was written in 1848, addressed to Mrs. Sarah Helen Whitman.

(3) Poe said that the early "To Helen" was addressed to "Helen Stannard" (doubtless Mrs. Jane Stith Stanard), not to "Helen Scullard," who is an entirely mythical being, the pen-child of Professor Bowra. Poe also said that this poem was written in his "boyhood," and others besides Professor Bowra have accepted this statement. But there is no positive evidence by which to date it before its first publication, in 1831, when the poet was twenty-two years old.²

EDWARD D. SNYDER

Haverford College

TENNYSON'S 'RINGING GROOVES' AND CAPTAIN AHAB'S GROOVED SOUL

Most persons with more than a passing interest in Tennyson know the story behind one of the often-quoted metaphors from *Locksley Hall*: the "ringing grooves of change" down which "the great world" is to "spin forever." Tennyson once admitted that when he composed the line, he had shortly before taken his first train ride, and he thought the wheels ran in a groove.

¹ *The Romantic Imagination*, by C. M. Bowra, Harvard University Press (Cambridge, Mass.), 1949, pp. 185-86. This book contains the lectures which Professor Bowra gave as Charles Eliot Norton Professor of Poetry at Harvard in 1948-49.

² An authoritative statement of scholarly opinion on many of the problems raised by this poem is conveniently available in a recent issue of this journal; see Paull F. Baum in *MLN*, LXIV (1929), 289-97.

Interestingly enough, Herman Melville seems to have been under much the same impression. In one of his most widely-quoted metaphors, he has Captain Ahab say, "The path to my fixed course is laid with iron rails, whereon my soul is grooved to run." Nor is this all. In "The Bell-Tower," Melville repeats Tennyson's error exactly: Bannadonna's arrangement for advancing the automaton into position to strike the bell is to slide the figure "along a grooved way, like a railway." Later in the same tale, Melville refers to Bannadonna's "deftly oiling the grooves whereon it [the automaton] was to slide."

TOM BURNAM

Colorado State College of Education

AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER OF MONCRIF CONCERNING DIDEROT'S "PÈRE DE FAMILLE"

The unpublished correspondence of François-Augustin Paradis de Moncrif contains an interesting letter, dated October 25, 1758, relating to Diderot's *Père de famille*. Already established as a writer of often amusing, if superficial, *contes*, *parades* and *romances*, a member of the French Academy, correspondent of Voltaire, former *secrétaire* of the comte de Clermont, a close friend of the marquis d'Argenson, frequenter of innumerable *sociétés badines*, an intimate of the royal circle striving to maintain his delicate position both as a *lecteur* of Marie Leszczyńska and as an assistant director of the *petits spectacles* of Madame de Pompadour, Moncrif likewise acted as a royal censor. In this capacity, he penned his letter concerning Diderot's play.

Apart from the irony of Moncrif's position permitting him to pass judgment on the works of his renowned contemporary, the letter is of importance in its candid statement of the suspicion in which Diderot was held at this time. Moncrif, author of the *Essai sur la nécessité et sur les moyens de plaire* (1738), supple in character, eager to bend his will to placate the idiosyncracies of his social superiors, preferring to agree rather than to voice opposing convictions, had no desire to approve a work written by a man so mistrusted by influential members of the royal circle, although he considered the play itself to be innocuous. He had witnessed the banishment of his faithful protector, the marquis d'Argenson, the

forced flight to Prussia of another friend of the marquis, the abbé de Prades. D'Alembert, Duclos and Marmontel, all acquaintances, had deserted Diderot following the Damiens incident. Perhaps he foresaw the enactment of decrees against the *Encyclopédie* in February and March of 1759. In any case, Moncrif respectfully requested that he be given no role in the *affaire* Diderot.

One may condemn Moncrif for lacking the moral fortitude to assume his responsibilities in the censorship of *Le Père de famille*. His personal opinion of the literary value of the play has, however, been largely upheld, despite the acclaim with which it was received during its first performance in Paris.

The letter, presumably addressed to M. de Malesherbes, follows:

A Paris ce 25 octob 1758

Monsieur

J'ai l'honneur de vous envoyer cy joint la comédie intitulée Le Pere de famille qui m'a été remise avant hier par le Sr Lambert de votre part. Je l'ai lue avec une extreme enuie d'y pouvoir mettre mon approbation, mais dans la disposition ou sont les esprits par rapport a l'auteur, il y a des choses qui peutetre ne seront pas prises dans le sens ou il les presente. On pourra aussi faire tres injustement des applications malignes de quelques endroits et on en rendra responsable l'approbateur. Je vous supplie donc d'agréer que je ne le sois pas.

J'ai l'honneur d'être avec l'attachement le plus sincere et le plus respectueux
Monsieur

Votre tres humble et tres
obeissant serviteur

De Moncrif

Je me suis présenté a votre hotel pour avoir l'honneur de vous rendre compte de ce que je viens de vous exposer. Vous etiez sorti et je retourne a Versailles.¹

E. P. SHAW

New York State College
for Teachers (Albany)

¹ Bibliothèque nationale, n. a. 1182, p. 31. Others apparently shared Moncrif's desire to avoid responsibility for the publication of Diderot's play. Three of the early editions of the *Père de famille* were published either in Holland or in Belgium (Amsterdam, 1758; Bruxelles, 1761; Amsterdam, 1762) and needed neither an *approbation* nor a *permis*. However, the first French editions contain no personal signature of a censor or censors. The edition of Besançon, 1765, contains only the notation "avec permission," and that of Paris, 1772, merely records "avec approbation et Privilège du Roi."

HUYSMANS TO MALLARMÉ: AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER

The attraction at the Odéon theatre on Thursday, November 18, 1886, was *Renée Mauperin*, an adaptation by Henry Céard of the famous novel by the Goncourt brothers. In honor of the *première*, the Alphonse Daudets were giving a dinner for the surviving brother, Edmond, and to that dinner were invited friends of the hosts as well as the most faithful members of Goncourt's recently established salon, the *Grenier*. Edmond naturally reported the event in his *Journal*, where we read, under date of "Jeudi, 18 novembre," the following entry: "Les Daudet sont le parrain et la marraine de ma pièce, et l'on soupe chez eux, où il y a quatre tables dans la salle à manger et une table dans l'antichambre pour les jeunes gens."

That is why, in the letter that follows,¹ the author of *A Rebours* declines the proposed meeting and suggests another date:

Mercredi

Mon cher ami,

Entendu, mais pas pour demain, jeudi, car j'ai un tas de courses et il faut que j'aille à l'Odéon, après un dîner rapide. Voulez-vous *samedi*, 5 heures, et si cela ne vous déplaisait point, en un café moins *plein* d'hommes de journaux que Tortoni—un lieu quelconque où des négociants cuveraient lentement leurs larcins; où vous voudrez, pourvu que les gens de lettres, dont la vue me soulève, soient loin!

Bien à vous, amitiés à Duret,² votre

J. K. Huysmans

ARTINE ARTINIAN

Bard College

¹ Addressed to Stéphane Mallarmé, 89 rue de Rome, E. V., postmarked 18 Nov. 86. The letter is in the present writer's collection.

² Presumably Théodore Duret, well-known art critic, friend of Mallarmé.

REVIEWS

Agrippa d'Aubigné's Les Tragiques [:] *A Study of the Baroque Style in Poetry*. By IMBRIE BUFFUM. New Haven: Yale University Press: 1951. Pp. 151. \$2.50.

Mr. Buffum's study is a major contribution to the scant bibliography on d'Aubigné and *Les Tragiques*. Traditional criticism has seen d'Aubigné as a "retardataire et égaré" and *Les Tragiques* as a triumph of obscurity, indeed, "illisible." Mr. Buffum considers the great Protestant poet one of the most representative figures of his time; draws parallels between d'Aubigné's daily life as a warrior and his "creative" life as a poet; views *Les Tragiques* as the product of conscious artistry rather than "emotional overflow," and attempts to isolate and define characteristics of the poem which, by comparison with roughly contemporaneous works of art in other media (for example, the painting of El Greco and the sculpture of Bernini), reveal the "baroque" qualities of d'Aubigné's style and spirit.

On the basic assumptions that style and spirit are related, that parallels can be drawn between the sculpture, painting, architecture, and literature of an age, and that the baroque is a distinct and recognizable style, Mr. Buffum examines both the "form" and "contents" of *Les Tragiques* and finds nine stylistic devices which characterize the poem as "baroque":

an essentially propagandistic purpose, 2) a technique of exaggeration and overstatement, 3) a predilection for horrifying subjects portrayed with vivid and gruesome detail, 4) the prevalence of theatrical scenes, 5) the use of the *merveilleux chrétien*, particularly in "two-storied" theatrical scenes, 6) a fondness for the color red, often with an almost symbolic value expressing cruelty or violence, 7) the description of divinity in terms of radiant light, 9) multiple sense imagery, 9) a highly emotional, indeed frequently erotic, conception of the relationship between human beings and God (p. 146).

These devices Mr. Buffum in turn groups together under the two large headings of *physicalness* and *paradox*: the two most characteristic elements in d'Aubigné's style and spirit.

Two problems immediately suggest themselves here: 1) whether it is possible to transfer criteria employed in the discussion of the fine arts to literature (assuming that those criteria are, in the first instance, precisely established); and 2) whether an examination of the poetic text as a structural entity and in the background of preceding literary tradition might yield completely different and, perhaps, more valid results. Mr. Buffum is not unaware of the

first of these problems, and observes with reference to the transfer of criteria:

. . . Wölfflin's famous categories for distinguishing Renaissance and baroque art . . . while setting up well-defined criteria for painting, sculpture, and architecture, do not appear to be applicable to literature. . . . The difference between the media of the fine arts and literature is such that any attempt at adapting Wölfflin's criteria is likely to result in vagueness and imprecision (p. 146).

He has also taken the second problem into account and declares his work to be inductive, in that it aims at the correlation of stylistic and ideological criteria; and, as well, "comparative," in that it is concerned with comparing *Les Tragiques* with other works of art rather than with analyzing the structure of the poem itself (the subtitle of the entire work is "A Study of the Baroque Style in Poetry").

D'Aubigné's "fondness for the color red, often with an almost symbolic value expressing cruelty or violence" and his predilection for describing divinity "in terms of radiant light"—to choose two of the nine devices as examples—do, indeed, offer striking parallels in baroque works of art and, in the context of a comparative study, appear to be typical baroque devices. In terms of the structure of *Les Tragiques*, however, "red" (appearing variously as "rouge," "pourpre," "escarlante," "cardinal," "sang," etc.) symbolizes not only cruelty and violence but all crime: the first crime of Cain against Abel and every crime thereafter. It is, moreover, one of the most important recurrent key-words in the poem not only because of the wide semantic range it suggests as "red," but as well because it is always opposed to "white" (appearing variously as "blanc," "pur," "lumière," "lait," etc.) which symbolizes goodness, light, purity, and every divine virtue. The poet's fondness for "red" and "white" reflects not an expression of baroque *zeitgeist*, but rather an appropriation of *traditional* stylistic devices which—like virtually all the other devices Mr. Buffum calls "baroque"—can be traced through western European literature directly to the Bible. The opposition of "rouge" and "blanc" is but one of many conflicts to be found in the poem (Catholicism *vs.* Protestantism, "loup" *vs.* "agneau," "mort" *vs.* "vie," etc.), all of which can be expressed generally as "nature" *vs.* "desnature." That conflict is, in turn, only an expression of the paradox in d'Aubigné's description of a "monde à l'envers." And the concept of a "monde à l'envers" is itself a traditional device (a 'topos' or commonplace), the history of which has been studied extensively by Professors Dutoit and Curtius.¹

Mr. Buffum summarizes his main thesis as follows:

¹ E. Dutoit, *Le Thème de l'Adynaton dans la Poésie Antique* (Paris, 1936); E. R. Curtius, "Zur Literaturästhetik des Mittelalters," *ZRPh*, 58, 1938 and *Europäische Literatur und Lateinisches Mittelalter* (Bern, 1948).

... the physicalness of *Les Tragiques* represents an attempt to give sensuous vividness to d'Aubigné's religious faith—d'Aubigné is actually striving to demonstrate the validity of his conception of God—in other words, to impose upon our minds a unified idea of truth. But this unified conception of the world is precisely what the other half of d'Aubigné's spirit cannot accept. The other half denies the possibility of unified explanation of reality and actually delights in this diversity. There results a fundamental tension of the soul. It is perhaps in this tension that we may find the essence of d'Aubigné's style and spirit—and indeed of the baroque style and spirit (p. 148).

I cannot agree with Mr. Buffum that the insistence on physicalness and paradox represent a repudiation of the geometrical, unified point of view; nor that the two aspects present an "unreconcilable dichotomy." The fundamental tension in d'Aubigné's soul derives not from any doubts concerning reality, his belief, his concept of God, nor the ultimate triumph of the "true Church"; but rather from righteous indignation and frustration on his part at the very existence of a "monde à l'envers" in which France is a "non-mere" and Nature is "desaturée": taking the form of paradox, that tension reflects d'Aubigné's, and every Calvinist's, continuing struggle to overcome evil and to restore an order based on truth and virtue.

It is possible to differ with Mr. Buffum on details and even on interpretation. But one cannot question the importance of his basic premise, the assumption of conscious artistry on d'Aubigné's part; nor the fact that he has, on the basis of that assumption and with acute analysis, succeeded in isolating and defining some of the most significant characteristics of d'Aubigné's style. For these reasons Mr. Buffum's work represents a substantial contribution to scholarly criticism on d'Aubigné and *Les Tragiques*.

HENRY A. SAUERWEIN

Albuquerque, N. M.

Lessing: Zwölf biographische Studien. By HEINRICH SCHNEIDER.
Bern: A. Francke Verlag, 1951. Pp. 315. Fr. 13.80.

This is not actually a new book on Lessing but in the main the republication, in book form, of a number of separate papers written in the course of the last twenty-five years. The author, himself a former librarian at Wolfenbüttel, confesses a primary life-long interest in the great eighteenth-century critic and thinker.

The preface is in part in the nature of an apology for this collection of preponderantly (ten out of twelve essays) pre-published material, rewritten and expanded here and there to be sure. Schneider informs us, with the utmost, almost belligerent candor, of his vigorous preference for positivistic, rock-bottom research.

He tells us that he is unashamedly interested in what he calls collection, criticism, and presentation of biographical data. It is therefore facts and data on Lessing which the reader is offered in this publication.

The actual papers on biographical and other more or less factual aspects of Lessing are preceded by new source material. There are first of all a fair number of new letters that have come to light since the completion of the Lachmann-Muncker edition in 1924. They are published here for the first time in their present totality. Then there is a group of new conversations with Lessing, which happily supplement the material made available by Biedermann.

This interesting new source material, contained on some forty pages, is followed by the chief body of the book. The story of Lessing and Wolfenbüttel is related with affectionate care. Lessing's work as librarian is defended against detractors old and new. Of the studies concerning friends of Lessing one might perhaps single out that on "Lessing und das Ehepaar Reiske" as shedding a good deal of light on Lessing's more personal life as well as on one of the more scholarly women of the age. One also reads with great interest Schneider's presentation of Eva König in Vienna.

The remaining essays on Jerusalem, the freemasons, Lessing's interest in America, etc. are significant additions to existing knowledge. Especially noteworthy is the essay on "Die Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts," Schneider definitely ascribing this important work to Lessing in its entirety.

Schneider's *Lessing* is not a book to be read consecutively perhaps, but rather a valued reference work to be placed in one's library next to Erich Schmidt's biography, the Lachmann-Muncker edition of the letters, and Biedermann's conversations with Lessing. It is an indispensable supplement to these basic tools of the student of Lessing, who is bound to be grateful to Professor Schneider for having put together in one volume the results of his labors on the life of a great figure of the eighteenth century. On the basis of these comprehensive preliminary studies the reader would welcome a new biography of Lessing from the learned author.

The book is both extensively and carefully annotated and indexed. There are four illustrations. I noticed two misprints on page 204: "... die Parteinahme an der amerikanische Revolution ...". "In England standen selbst die Wighs der Freiheitsbewegung. ...". Inasmuch as the place of previous publication is conscientiously given for all reprinted materials in the generous notes, one wonders why this information is not furnished in the case of the essay on "Eva Lessing in Wien." It is probably just an oversight in an otherwise exact (and exacting) book.

HEINZ BLUHM

Yale University

Letters to Benvenuta. By RAINER MARIA RILKE. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. Pp. 87. \$2.75.

The smallest book in the Philosophical Library, and perhaps the most precious, is Rilke's *Letters to Benvenuta*. It has several claims to a unique place in the endless Rilke literature: it is the only volume of love letters by this poet of love, it contains his most personal letters, and it contains his most sustained self-analyses. They were all written in February 1914, thus many of Rilke's letters to Benvenuta might still be left unpublished. The day on which Magda von Hattingberg should consent to publish the entire correspondence, including her own letters, would be a holy day of obligation for the entire Rilke community.

To read the translation is a pleasure. Heinz Norden, the prolific translator of political books, did very well in this so different medium. It is almost impossible to discover errors. "Manche Deiner Wege kenne ich wohl," is not "I know many of your errands" (p. 31), but "I may be familiar with some of the streets." The translator deserves to be praised for choosing, of two ways out, not the one that leads to vagueness, but rather that of over-precision. "... statt die paar Worte zu treffen, die Ihnen vielleicht wohlzutun könnten, Dir—Du mir Gekommene." "... rather than hitting upon the few words that might possibly give *you* balm—you—thee who hast come to me" (p. 47). A rather touching example of the translator's effort to be faithful.

To pass from the translation to the original (*So laß ich mich zu Träumen gehen*, Gmunden, 1949) is breathtaking. In vain you resist the extravagance of diction, it establishes itself, it enthralls you. And if the poet's self-searchings are only fragmentary, and never unveiling, they reach in the best psychoanalytic style into his remotest memories, of childhood, early family life, earliest sensations of love, military academy. They also show the man of forty as intensely genuine, human, and wretched. Thanks to the two Benvenuta publications the darkest period of Rilke's life, immediately before the World War, has become the best illuminated.

The English edition has, in addition to two introductions, a real *Zugabe*, a picture of Magda v. Hattingberg, and a new one of Rilke.

NORBERT FUERST

Indiana University

BRIEF MENTION

Andreas Gryphius, Catharina von Georgien, ed. by WILLI FLEMING (Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke des XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderts Nr. 261-262). Halle: Niemeyer, 1951. This second reprinting brings the introduction of the first of 1928 up to date with added bibliographical references. A paragraph on the source, two on the stage effect and one on the literary influence of the play reflect the results of interim investigations. About a page and a half are thus added to the introduction. Although the paper is a deterioration over the 1928 printing, the print of the text is the same except for the welcome substitution of umlaut ä, ü, ö for superscript e.

STANLEY WERBOW

The Johns Hopkins University

CORRESPONDENCE

THE DEATH OF WILLIAM III: A CORRECTION. At the end of his *History of England* Macaulay reports that, when William III died, a ribbon containing a lock of Queen Mary's hair was found "next his skin." According to Mr. Cordasco (*MLN*, LXIV, 21-3), this anecdote came from Smollett, who got it from Tindal's translation of Rapin de Thoyras. He adds that the story "is unique with M. Rapin de Thoyras; no source available to him mentions the occurrence." But, as his history stops with the accession of William and Mary, it makes no mention of William's death. It is true that this event is described by David Durand, who composed the eleventh volume of Rapin's *Histoire d'Angleterre*, but he is also silent about Mary's hair. The responsible party is Tindal, not Rapin de Thoyras. It is by no means sure that he invented the anecdote, for he may have taken it from one of the sources mentioned in the *To the Reader* of the 1747 edition: "Histories and Treatises" and "Manuscripts which have been communicated to the Continuator. . . ."

H. C. LANCASTER

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

- Abercrombie, Lascelles.—The Art of Wordsworth. *London*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1952. Pp. viii + 157. \$2.50.
- Bate, Walter J. (ed.).—Criticism: The Major Texts. *New York*: Harcourt, Brace, 1951. Pp. xii + 610.
- Cadwalader, John (ed.).—King Edward The Third, with The Fall of Mortimer Earl of Marsh, 1391. Univ. of Penna. diss., 1949. Pp. vi + 88.
- Conner, Frederick W.—Cosmic Optimism: a study of The Interpretation of Evolution by American Poets from Emerson to Robinson. Univ. of Penna. diss., 1949. Pp. xiv + 458.
- Donne, John.—Essays in Divinity. Ed. Evelyn M. Simpson. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press, 1952. Pp. xxx + 137. \$4.00.
- Eshleman, Dorothy H.—Elizabeth Griffith. Univ. of Penna. diss., 1949. Pp. viii + 131.
- Fineman, Daniel A.—Leonard Welsted. Univ. of Penna. diss., 1950. Pp. 233.
- Galbraith, Lois H.—The Established Clergy as Depicted in English Prose Fiction from 1740 to 1800. Univ. of Penna. diss., 1950. Pp. xiv + 126.
- Grant, William and D. D. Murison (eds.).—The Scottish National Dictionary. III, part 4 (draven-ezle). *Edinburgh*: Scottish Nat. Dict. Ass., 1952. Pp. xii + 120.
- Harmer, F. E.—Anglo-Saxon Writs. Manchester: U. Press [N. Y.: Barnes & Noble], 1952. Pp. xxii + 604.
- Jonson, Ben.—Masque of Gipsies. An Attempt at Reconstruction, by W. W. Greg. *London*: Oxford Univ. Press (for The British Academy), 1952. Pp. x + 235. \$6.00.
- Kendig, Perry F.—The Poems of St. Columban translated into English Verse. Univ. of Penna. diss., 1949. Pp. x + 80.
- Long, E. Hudson.—O. Henry: A Biographical Study. Univ. of Penna. diss., 1947. Pp. 51.
- Nannes, Casper H.—Politics in the American Drama as Revealed by Plays Produced on the New York Stage, 1890-1945. Univ. of Penna. diss., 1950. Pp. viii + 160.
- Pavese, C.—La letteratura americana e altri scritti. *Turin*: Einaudi, 1951, xxxiv + 367 pp. L. 1500.

Robbins, Rossell H. (ed.).—Secular Lyrics of the XIVth and XVth Centuries. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press, 1952. Pp. lviii + 331. \$3.50.

Rynell, Alarik.—Parataxis and Hypotaxis as a Criterion of Syntax and Style Especially in Old English Poetry. *Lund*: Gleerup, n.d. Pp. 60. (Lunds Univ. Årsskrift, 48, no. 3.)

Schmidt, Karl Ernst.—Die Bühnenprobe als Lustspieltyp in der Englischen Literatur. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1952. Pp. 32.

Shirk, Samuel B.—The Characterization of George Washington in American Plays since 1875. Univ. of Penna. diss., 1949. Pp. 135.

Stafford, John.—The Literary Criticism of "Young America": a Study in The Relationship of Politics and Literature, 1837-1850. *Berkeley and Los Angeles*: Univ. of California Press, 1952. Pp. 154. \$2.00. (Univ. of Calif. Pubs., English Studies, 3.)

Steeves, Edna L. (ed.).—The Art of Sinking in Poetry. Martinus Scriblerus' ΠΕΡΙ ΒΑΘΟΥΣ. *New York*: King's Crown Press, 1952. Pp. lxxii + 207. \$3.75.

Thomas, Wright, and Brown, S. G. (eds.).—Reading Prose. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1952. Pp. xvi + 703.

Wordsworth, W. and Coleridge, S. T.—Lyrical Ballads, 1798. Ed. by F. W. Schulze. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1952. Pp. x + 200.

GERMAN

* Bense Max.—Die Theorie Kafkas. *Köln*: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1952. 120 pp. DM. 7.80.

* Frenzel, Herbert A. (ed.).—Daten deutscher Dichtung. Chronol. Abriss der deutschen Literaturgeschichte von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. *Köln*: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1952. 450 pp. DM. 14.80.

* Lukacs, Georg.—Deutsche Realisten des 19. Jahrhunderts. *Bern*: A Francke, 1951. 308 pp. Sfr. 19.-

Meyer, Erika.—Elementary German. *Boston*: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1952. xiv + 141 pp. \$2.-

* Schiller.—Wallenstein. Ein dramatisches Gedicht. Ed. by WILLIAM WITTE [Blackwell's German Texts]. *Oxford*: Basil Blackwell, 1952. xlii + 356 pp. 17s. 6d.

Schneider, Georg.—Die Schlüsselliteratur. Bd. 1 Das literar. Gesamtbild. *Stuttgart*: Hiersemann Verlag, 1952. 214 pp. DM. 16.-

* Walther von der Vogelweide.—Thirty New English Renderings in the Original Forms

with the MHG Texts, Selected Modern German Translations and an Introduction by E. H. ZEYDEL & B. Q. MORGAN. *Ithaca*: Thrift Press, 1952. 78 pp. \$1.10.

DUTCH

Foppema, Yge.—Het Fries in Nederland. *Drachten*: Laverman. 60 pp.

Leopold, L.—Nederlandse schrijvers en schrijfters. 2 v. *Groningen*: Wolters, 1951. xv + 452 + xiv + 475 pp.

Pauwels, J. L.—De vlierboom in de Zuid-nederlandse dialecten. Reprinted from *Toponymie en Dialectologie*, xxv (1951), 322-338.

Vooy, C. G. N. de.—Engelse invloed op de Nederlandsche woordvoorraad. *Amsterdam*: Noord-Hollandsche U. M., 1952. 74 pp.

SCANDINAVIAN

Baetke, Walter (ed.).—Hrafnkels saga freysgoða. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1952. viii + 108 pp.

Benson, A. B.—American Scandinavian Studies, ed. M. W. S. Swan. *New York*: Am.-Scandinavian Foundation, 1952. xvi + 381 pp. \$5.00.

Stuyver, Clara.—Ibsens dramatische Gestalten. Psychologie und Symbolik. *Amsterdam*: Noord-Hollandsche. U. M., 1952. 549 pp.

FRENCH

Alessio, Giovanni.—Grammatica storica francese. I: Introd., fonetica. *Bari*: Ed. Leonardo da Vinci, 1951. 339 pp. L. 2400.

Balzac.—La Peau de chagrin, éd. Michel Carrouges. *Paris*: Club fr. du livre, 1951. 328 pp. Fr. 600.

— Le Père Goriot, éd. René Lemaire. *Paris*: Hachette, 1951. 96 pp. Fr. 49.

Baudelaire.—Œuvres, éd. Y.-G. Le Dantec. *Paris*: Gallimard, 1951. 1550 pp.

Beaumarchais.—Le Mariage de Figaro, éd. Raymond Jean. *Paris*: Hachette, 1951. 128 pp. Fr. 49.

— Théâtre. Lettres relatives à son théâtre. Ed. Maurice Allem. *Paris*: Gallimard, 1949. 719 pp.

Chardon, Pierre.—Expliquez-moi Balzac. II. Le Penseur et l'artiste. *Paris*: Foucher, 1951. 64 pp.

Chiari, Joseph.—Contemporary French Poetry. Foreword by T. S. Eliot. *New York*: Philosophical Library, 1952. xvi + 180 pp.

Cohen, Gustave.—Tableau de la littérature française médiévale, idées et sensibilités. *Paris*: Richard-Masse, 1950. 149 pp.

Cole, A. H. and G. B. Watts.—The Handicrafts of France as Recorded in the *Descriptions des Arts et Métiers* 1761-88. *Boston*: Baker Library, 1952. 43 pp.

Corneille.—Théâtre, éd. Pierre Lièvre et Roger Caillois. 2v. *Paris*: Gallimard, 1950.

Daniel-Rops, H.—Charles Péguy. *Brescia*: Morcelliana, 1951. 188 pp. L. 500.

Diderot.—Œuvres romanesques, éd. Henri Bénac. *Paris*: Garnier, 1951. xviii + 909 pp. Fr. 750.

Evans, D. O.—Social Romanticism in France, 1830-48. *London*: Oxford U. Press, 1952. 149 pp. 12/6.

Flowers, Ruth C.—Voltaire's Stylistic Transformation of Rabelaisian Satirical Devices. *Catholic U. diss.*, 1951. 140 pp.

Gautier, Th.—Poésies choisies, ed. André Hinard. *Paris*: Hachette, 1951. 96 pp. Fr. 49.

Henry, Albert.—Langage et poésie chez Paul Valéry. *Paris*: Mercure de France, 1951. 175 pp. Fr. 360.

Hugo.—Hernani. Marion de Lorme. Préface de Michel Braspart. *Givors*: Martel, 1951. Fr. 2000.

— Les Misérables, éd. Maurice Allem. *Paris*: Gallimard, 1951. 1806 pp. Fr. 2500.

— Œuvres complètes. Le Roi s'amuse. Lucrèce Borgia. Préface de Michel Braspart. *Givors*: Martel, 1951. v + 325 pp. Fr. 2000.

— Pierres. Textes rassemblés et présentés par H. Guillemin. *Geneva*: Ed. du Milieu du monde, 1951. 353 pp. SFr. 7.50.

Landolfi et Luzi (eds.).—Anthologie de la poésie lyrique française. *Florence*: Sansoni, 1951. 670 pp. L. 2500.

Laurent, Jules.—Joseph de Maistre. *Monte Carlo*: Regain, 1951. 60 pp. Fr. 300.

Lebègue, Raymond.—La Poésie française de 1560 à 1630. 2v. *Paris*: Soc. d'éd. d'enseignement supérieur, 1951. Fr. 800.

Marivaux.—Les Fausses Confidences, éd. P.-B. Marquet. *Paris*: Larousse, 1951. 104 pp. Fr. 55.

Maupassant.—Contes choisis, éd. Albert Sablayrolles. *Paris*: Hachette, 1951. 96 pp. Fr. 55.

Mérimée.—Romans et nouvelles, éd. Henri Martineau. *Paris*: Gallimard, 1951. 861 pp.

Molière.—Ecole des femmes, éd. P. Pouget. *Paris*: Hachette, 1951. 96 pp. Fr. 55.

Montaigne.—Essais, éd. Albert Thibaudet. *Paris*: Gallimard, 1950. 1274 pp.

Musset.—On ne bodine pas avec l'amour,

éd. J. Déchenaud. *Paris*: Hachette, 1951. 63 pp. Fr. 55.

Peytel, Adrien.—Balzac juriste romannique. *Paris*: Ponsot, 1950. 349 pp. Fr. 800.

Pfeiffer, Rubin.—First year French. *New York*: Holt, 1951. vi + 126 + xlix pp. \$2.36.

Plinval, G. de.—Précis d'histoire de la litt. fr. *Paris*: Hachette, 1951. 320 pp. Fr. 450.

Poulet, Georges.—Etudes sur le temps humain. II. La Distance intérieure. *Paris*: Plon, 1952. 357 pp.

Rodenbach, André (éd.).—Anthologie de poètes belges. T. 2. *Niort*: Maynard, 1951. 56 pp.

Roth, Georges (éd.).—Les Pseudo-mémoires de Mme d'Epinay. Hist. de Mme de Montbrillant. 3 v. *Paris*: Gallimard, 1951.

Roy, Jules.—Passion de Saint-Exupéry. *Paris*: Gallimard, 1951. 103 pp. Fr. 180.

Staaks, Walter.—The Theater of Louis-Benoît Picard. *Berkeley and L. A.*: U. of Cal. Press, 1952. viii + 104 pp. (U. of Cal. Pubs., vol. 28, no. 7.)

Suarès et Claudel.—Correspondance, 1904-38, éd. Robert Mallet. *Paris*: Gallimard, 1951. 271 pp.

Tielrooy, J.—Jean Racine. Leven en werk. *Amsterdam*: de Bussy, 1951. 84 pp.

Verlaine.—Œuvres poétiques complètes, éd. Y.-G. Le Dantec. *Paris*: Gallimard, 1951. xxii + 1342 pp.

Vuillart, Germain.—Lettres à M. Louis de Préfontaine (1694-1700), éd. Ruth Clark. *Geneva*: Droz, 1951. 453 pp.

Vigny.—Chatterton, éd. L. Roinet. *Paris*: Hatier, 1951. 120 pp. Fr. 40.

Villon.—Œuvres, éd. André Mary. *Paris*: Garnier, 1951. xxvi + 285 pp. Fr. 390.

PROVENÇAL

Sneyders de Vogel, K.—Geschiedenis der Provençaalse letterkunde. *The Hague*: Servire, 1951. 107 pp.

ITALIAN

Alfieri, Vittorio.—Vita scritta da esso. Ed. Luigi Fassò. 2 v. *Asti*: Casa d'Alfieri, 1951. lxiv + 369 + 319 pp.

Goldoni.—La finta ammalata. La locandiera. Ed. Enrico Bianchi. *Florence*: Salani, 1951. 125 pp.

Guicciardini.—Ricordi, ed. Ettore Janni. *Milan*: Rizzoli, 1951. 139 pp. L. 120.

Leonetti, P.—L'espressione letteraria. *Messina*: D'Anna, 1951. 230 pp.

Li Gotti, E. (ed.).—Vulgare nostro siculo. Crestomazia di testi siciliani del sec. xiv. *Florence*: Nuova Italia, 1951. xxiv + 196 pp.

Manzoni.—Liriche, tragedie e prose ed. Luigi Russo. Nuova ed. accresciuta. *Florence*: Sansoni, 1951. xxiv + 326 pp. L. 650.

Milano, E.—Come ti chiami? I nomi propri di persona nella storia, nella lingua e nell'uso. *Turin*: SEI, 1951. 235 pp. L. 600.

Sertori, Salis R.—Dizionario dei nomi propri di persona. *Milan*: Ceschina, 1951. 250 pp.

SPANISH

Alarcón.—La Verdad sospechosa, éd. G. Delpy et S. Denis. *Paris*: Hachette, 1951. xviii + 266 pp. Fr. 380.

Amorim, Enrique.—El Asesino desvelado, ed. J. C. Herman and A. M. Brady. *Boston*: Houghton Mifflin, 1952. 152 pp. \$2.00.

Brady, A. M. and L. H. Turk (eds.).—Cuentos y comedias. *Boston*: Houghton Mifflin, 1952. xvi + 304 pp. \$3.00.

Calderón.—Teatro, ed. J. M. Pemán. *Barcelona*: Edit. Exito, 1951. xxiii + 387 pp.

Casona, Alejandro.—La Sirena varada, ed. R. C. Gillespie. *New York*: Appleton, 1951. xix + 139 pp. \$1.25.

Castellano, J. R. and W. K. Jones.—Spanish Through Speech. *New York*: Scribner, 1951. xv + 205 pp. \$2.25.

Cervantes.—Don Quijote, ed. J. Delgado Campos. 2 v. *Paris*: Bouret, 1951. Fr. 980.

Fernández, S.—Gramática esp. i Los sonidos, el nombre y el pronombre. *Madrid*: Rev. de Occidente, 1951. xliii + 498 pp.

Fernández Pousa, Ramón.—Selección literaria del Idioma Gallego, siglos xi-xx. *Madrid*: autor, 1951. 198 pp.

García Prada, C. and W. E. Wilson (eds.).—Nuevas lecturas. *Boston*: Heath, 1952. viii + 324 pp. \$2.60.

Green, Otis H.—Courtly Love in Quevedo. *Boulder*: U. of Colorado Press, 1952. 82 pp. (U. of Colo. Studies, L. and L., 3.)

Guerrero Zamora, Juan.—Noticia sobre Miguel Hernández. *Madrid*: Política y Literatura, 1951. 61 pp.

Guyer, F. E. and Fr. Ugarte.—Pláticas y temas sobre la América esp. *Boston*: Heath, 1952. viii + 298 pp. \$2.60.

Johnston, M. C.—En marcha; a first course in Spanish. *New York*: Ungar, 1952. v + 296 pp. \$2.75.

Kany, C. E.—Practical Spanish Grammar. *Boston*: Heath 1951. viii + 189 pp. \$2.25.

Kolster, T. A.—Technical Dictionary. *New York*: Stechert-Hafner, 1951. 394 pp. \$5.00.

Marasso Rocca, Arturo.—Antología didáctica de la prosa española. *Buenos Aires*: Kapelus, 1951. xxi + 493 pp.

Moreno, Miguel.—Antología poética, ed. M. Moreno-Mora. *Cuenca*: Cultura Ecuatoriana, 1951. 84 pp.

Rojas, Muriel.—La ciudad de los Césares, ed. R. B. Sangiorgi and G. Knopp. *New York*: Appleton, 1951. xii + 237 pp. \$2.25.

Pérez Galdós, Benito.—Marianela, ed. N. B. Adams. *Boston*: Ginn, 1951. x + 197 pp. \$1.75.

Ratcliff, D. F.—Intermediate Sp. Grammar. *New York*: Holt, 1952. x + 288 + liii pp. \$2.60.

Resnick, Seymour.—Welcome to Spanish; a grammar and reader. *New York*: Ungar, 1952. v + 192 pp. \$2.50.

Van Loo, Esther.—Le vrai Don Juan: Don Miguel de Mañara. *Paris*: Steft, 1950. 319 pp.

Vega, Lope de.—Fuenteovejuna, ed. Eugene Kohler. *Strasbourg*: Heitz, 1952. 142 pp.

Vicente, A. Z.—Las "Sonatas" de Ramón Valle-Inclán. *Buenos Aires*: Univ. de B. A., 1951. 272 pp.

Walton, L. B.—Spanish by Yourself. *Toronto*: Clarke, Irwin, 1951. 220 pp. \$2.00.

Zaldumbide, G.—Cuatro clásicos americanos: de Villarroel, Aguirre, Montalvo y Rudó. *Madrid*: Cultura Hispánica, 1951.

PORTUGUESE

Carvalho, Afonso de.—Como disse Eça de Queiroz. Dicionário de suas sugestivas idéias, imagens e descrições. *Oporto*: Lello, 1949. xviii + 372 pp.

Carvalho, Joaquim de.—Estudos sobre a cultura portuguesa do século xv. V. I. *Coimbra*: Acta Univ. Conimb., 1949. iv + 365 pp.

Cortésão, J. Z.—Eça de Queiroz e a questão social. *Lisbon*: Seara Nova, 1949. 217 pp.

Costa, Agenor.—Dicionário de sinónimos e locuções da língua portuguesa. 2 v. *Rio de Janeiro*: Imp. Nacional, 1950. 2,259 pp.

Cunha, C. F. da.—O Cancioneiro de Joan Zorro. *Rio de Janeiro*: Imp. Nacional, 1949. xxiv + 97 pp.

Figueiredo, Fidelino de.—A Epica Portu-

guesa no século xvi. *São Paulo*: U. de S. Paulo, 1950. 408 pp.

— Estudos de Literatura. *Ibid.*, 1951. 246 pp.

Pinto, Araújo, e Colares.—Antologia de poetas da nova geração. *Rio de Janeiro*: Pongetti, 1950. 166 pp.

Silva, O. M. da.—A reforma ortográfica e os nomes personativos. *Rio de Janeiro*: Jornal do Commercio, 1950. 112 pp.

Silva Neto, Serafim da.—Introd. ao estudo da língua portuguesa no Brasil. *Rio de Janeiro*: Imp. Nacional, 1950. 287 pp.

RUSSIAN

Bond, O. F. and G. V. Bobrinskoy.—Graded Russian Readers. *Boston*: Heath, 1952. \$2.60.

Griboiedov, A. S.—Gore ot uma; comedy ed. D. P. Costello. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1952. xxvii + 202 pp. \$3.00.

Manning, C. A.—Anthology of Eighteenth Century Russian Lit. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1951. vi + 103 pp. \$2.00.

Maslenikov, O. A.—Frenziel Poets; Andrey Biely and the Russian Symbolists. *Berkeley*: U. of Cal. Press, 1952. x + 234 pp. \$3.75.

Turgenev, I. S.—Poems in Prose, ed. André Mazon, tr. by Garnett and Rees. *Oxford*: Blackwell, 1952. 219 pp. 12/6.

— Three Famous Plays, tr. by C. Garnett. *New York*: Scribner, 1952. xiii + 235 pp. \$3.00.

Vasmer, Max.—Russisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. 5. Lieferung. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1951. 80 pp. DM. 6.30.

GENERAL

Bibliography, Linguistic, for 1949 and Supplement for Previous Years. *Utrecht*: Het Spectrum, 1952. xxiv + 283 pp.

Estrich and Sperber.—Three Keys to Language. *New York*: Rinehart, 1952. xii + 358 pp. \$4.00.

Hankiss, Jean.—La Littérature et la vie. Obra publ. e pref. por F. de Figueiredo. *São Paulo*: U. de S. Paulo, 1951. viii + 329 pp. (Boletins de faculdade de fil., C. e let., cxxiv.)

Spina, Sigismundo.—Fenomenos formais da poesia primitiva. *São Paulo*: U. de S. Paulo, 1950. 120 pp.

Johns Hopkins

Diderot

Supplement au Voyage de Bougainville

Publié d'après le manuscrit de Leningrad

Avec une introduction et des notes par

GILBERT CHINARD

"As the title indicates, the publication of this curious and masterly dialogue is of manifold importance. The text itself is a valuable document, the introduction and notes a significant chapter, in the history of primitivism. . . . The wealth of material in the introduction and notes, suggesting possible sources, literary allusions, and probable influences, testifies to Mr. C.'s exceptional command of his subject."—Norman L. Torrey in *Modern Language Notes*, Nov., 1936

Chateaubriand

Les Nachez

Publié avec une introduction et des notes par

GILBERT CHINARD

"Professor Chinard suggests (p. 99) that we have no better clue to the inner life of Chateaubriand before 1802 than the tangled narratives and confused reflections of *Les Nachez*. This consideration alone seems to me important enough to justify the thoroughness with which he has prepared his edition."—Frederick Anderson in *Modern Language Notes*, Nov., 1936

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE 18, MD.

GRADED ITALIAN READERS

previously published separately in five booklets:

- Amici di scuola
- Raccontini
- Giulietta e Romeo e altre Novelle
 - I miei ricordi (di Massimo D'Azeglio)
 - Il Ventaglio (di Goldoni)



now available in one volume:

Letture Varie

written or edited by

CIOFFARI and VAN HORNE

Short interesting units, scientifically graded. Excellent basic vocabulary that will train students in independent reading at an early age. (Heath-Chicago Italian Series)

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Sales Offices: New York • Chicago • San Francisco • Atlanta • Dallas
Home Office: Boston

E. M. W. Tillyard

AUTHOR OF

Studies in Milton
The Elizabethan World Picture
The Poetry of Sir Thomas Wyatt

Now Writes

THE ENGLISH RENAISSANCE:

FACT OR FICTION?

A noted English scholar examines the Medieval and Renaissance traditions in three widely separated areas of literature: the lyric, the epic, and literary criticism. Introduction by Don Cameron Allen. \$3.00

The Johns Hopkins Press
Baltimore 18, Md.

A 2nd Printing of
Stefán Einarsson's

ICELANDIC
Grammar — Texts — Glossary
6 x 9 539 pages

A grammar, text, and glossary all in one, this volume is designed for immediate and practical use as an up to date guide to the Icelandic language. \$5.50

ORDER TODAY

The Johns Hopkins Press
Baltimore 18, Maryland